00027576

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 10 February, 2016

EXERCISES,

POLITICAL AND OTHERS.

27576 ac

By Lieut. Colonel T. Perronet Thompson.

Consisting of matter previously published with and without the author's name, and of some not published before.

IN SIX VOLUMES.

2R 119

VOL. V.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY EFFINGHAM WILSON, ROYAL EXCHANGE.

1842.

052
Thu/Ex
27576

London: W. Clowes and Sons, Stamford Street.

00027576

PREFACE

TO ALL THE VOLUMES.

THE first impression on review of this publication, part of which dates from a considerable time back, is the very slight degree in which circumstances are substantially altered. Like the mounted sentries at the Horse Guards, they might be taken for the same instead of a succession; so like in all important points is the new face of things to the old. It may not be John, it may be Robert, whose feet are actually in the stirrups; but Robert and John are one, in the eyes of the rustic spectator who looks only to the general effect.

Scarcely any great quarrel existed at the earliest period referred to, of which the roots are not as much in the ground as ever, though some of the stalks have been pulled up. The argument on the Catholic Question, may be re-read with a transference to Church Monopolies of other kinds; and the agitation preceding the Reform Bill, may hold a lantern to show how little has been accomplished, and how much thrown away.

In the department of Political Economy, something like a manual for one side of the struggle at this moment at its height, may be collected from the subjects and quotations introduced.

On what has obtained the name of the "Greatest-Happiness Principle," a continued discussion will be found kept up. The writer would be glad to think he had availed to make the subject clearer, to any of those who profess to find difficulties in the style or matter of the original propounder.

On the Military System of Napoleon, he has endeavoured to collect and compress, what might be sought and perhaps missed, in the pages of bulletins and the comments of friends and foes. On some military questions of detail, articles and observations will be found, which must owe any interest, to having been framed under the guidance of experiment, and published generally with some view to the advancement of the liberal cause.

On the principles of Geometry as connected with the *vexata quæstio* of the Theory of Parallels, inquiries may be found which, like those of the alchemists, lead to useful results though without implying a claim to general success. On the mathematics of Music, observations and experiments will be met with, which when the tide shall set in that direction, may be turned to the improvement of the executive branch of Harmony.

The documents connected with Sierra Leone point to remarkable facts in the history of that colony. The Treaty of January

1820 in the Persian Gulph, is a transcript of the first public act in which the Slave Trade was written down Piracy.

The "Letters of a Representative" were written to the constituency of Hull, during a short period of sitting in parliament. That the consequence on the first opportunity was permanent exclusion from the House of Commons, by the exertions at different times and places of the leaders of almost every class assuming the name of Liberals, may be not without its value to such as may ever employ themselves in raking among the characteristics of the times. *Eight* Conservatives, with more or less directness, were introduced in part of process; of whom five were on the benches at once, making a difference of ten upon the votes, being within two or three of some of the majorities by which the Whigs were expelled from office.

On Irish questions, the author has gone as close to the enemy, as any sane leader could desire. The return made him, was fierce attack from the "boys" of Kilkenny, when he was seen ridden over as in the way of the compact by which three kingdoms were turned over to the Tories.

Both in those Letters, and others to various portions of the public press which follow, useful references will be found to gone-by events, and to the feelings and arguments by which they were attended. If proof is sometimes presented of the prudence of dealing with enemies as if they were some day to be friends, and with friends as if they were to be enemies, there can be nothing surprising in finding a precept of antiquity confirmed by the experience of the passing hour.

On one point, an observation may be serviceable. The writer adhered to the people called Chartists, till they denounced him in their gazette and added the enormous childishness of telling the House of Commons they wanted an edge tool and wanted it to cut the givers' throats. On such adhesion, there will of course be a diversity of opinions; but there are always enough to quit the party of the poor, the moment abiding by it will make an unfavourable balance of twenty votes at an election. The observation intended was, that much of what the Chartists did not use, might be found cut and dried for any other portion of the public, who should apply themselves to compass a substantial and not a mock Reform.

To A. S., G. S., and S. B., Esqs., the survivors of the friends mentioned in the Appendix, the thanks of the writer are due, for the readiness with which they permitted the use of Articles in which a mixture of hands was concerned.

Blackheath, London. 1 *August*, 1842.

INDEX TO ALL THE VOLUMES

VOL. I.

Articles from the Westminster Review, 1829—1831 ; as follow. Page

Catholic Question (republished as "*Catholic State Waggon*") . 1
Béranger's *Songs* 36
Absenteeism 52
System of Fagging 58
Banking 63
Disabilities of the Jews 70
Poor Humphrey's Calendar 79
Forty-Shilling Freeholders 82
Corn Laws 87
Quipos, or Peruvian Knot-Records 96
"*Greatest-Happiness Principle.*" No. I. 121
Slavery in the West Indies 136
Essays on the Pursuit of Truth, &c. 152
Desirableness of the Re-union of Belgium to France . . . 165
Edinburgh Review and the "Greatest-Happiness Principle." No. II. 180
Free Trade 191
Radical Reform 219
Edinburgh Review and the "Greatest-Happiness Principle." No. III. 229
Taxes on Literature, The "Six Acts" 247
Le Représentant des Peuples 261
Religious Disabilities 269
Distress of the Country 278
Great Britain and France 287
Geometry without Axioms 306
Revolution of 1830 313
Defensive Force 328
East-India Trade 344
Machine-Breaking 353
European Revolution 373
Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society 381
Parliamentary Reform 413
Poland and France 429
Annals and Antiquities of Rajast'han 437
Military System of Napoleon 440
Belgium and the Holy Alliance 453
Quarterly Journal of Education 462
Appel aux Représentans de la France 473
Prospects from Tory Reaction 478

Programmes to various Nos. to be found in their order.

VOL. II.

Page

Articles from Westminster Review, 1832—1833; as follow.

Archbishop of Dublin on Political Economy 1
Adjustment of the House of Peers 23
Saint-Simonianism, &c. 34
Improvement of Condition of the Clergy 75
Silk and Glove Trades 95
Enharmonic of the Ancients 99
French Commerce 159
Dr. Chalmers *on Political Economy* 167
Renewal of Bank Charter 200
Supplement to Article on Silk and Glove Trades . . . 218
Prospects of Reform 225
McCulloch's *Edition of the "Wealth of Nations"* . . . 238
Gardiner's *Music of Nature* 282
Second Supplement to Article on Silk and Glove Trades . . 303
Wainewright's *Vindication of Paley. Fort Risban* . . . 306
Supplement to Article on Renewal of Bank Charter . . . 314
Viscount Milton's *Address to the Landowners on the Corn Laws* 316
The Fall of the Constitution 320
Report of Secret Committee on Bank Charter 329
Harmonics of the Violin 337
Bishop of Bath and Wells *on Commutation of Tithes* . . 345
Colonel Torrens's *Letters on Commercial Policy* . . . 351
Third Supplement to Article on Silk and Glove Trades . . 358
Policy, Justice, and Consequences of the Dutch War. . . . 368
Equitable Adjustment (with Tables by Mr. J. Childs of Bungay). 374
Booth's *Free Trade as it affects the People* 392
Effects of Abolition and Commutation of Tithes . . . 401
Fourth Supplement to Article on Silk and Glove Trades . . 406
Colonel Torrens's *Additional Letters on Commercial Policy.* . 409
Musical Periodicals 414
Ireland 417
Property Tax 433
Whewell's *First Principles of Mechanics* 441
Nathan *on the History and Theory of Music* 459
A Free Trader's Defence of the "Mercantile System" . . 466
London University Magazine. Note on Austin's Jurisprudence . 479
Otto *on the Violin* 482
Question of Absenteeism reducible to the Principles of Free Trade 486
Notes and Additions to various parts 496
Programmes to various Nos. to be found in their order.

VOL. III.

Articles from Westminster Review, 1834—1835, with Appendix; as follow.

	Page
Dr. Chalmers's *Bridgewater Treatise*	2
Jews' Harps, &c. Life of Eulenstein	22
Importance of Belgian Independence	36
Economy of paying twice over	43
The Suffering Rich	70
Royal Society, and M. Legendre	79
Use of the Subjunctive Mood in English	89
Impressment and Flogging	93
Quarterly Review, &c. in Support of Corn Monopoly	100
Bentham's *Deontology*	108
Pamphlet in Modern Greek and French, on Out-post Cavalry	126
Do. on Telegraphers for Field Service, horse and foot	134
First Report of Messrs. Villiers and Bowring	137
Cab and Omnibus Nuisance	148
Bordwine's *New System of Fortification*	153
John Hopkins on Political Economy	159
Enharmonic Organ	165
Contre-Enquête	177
Lady Morgan's *Princess*	216
Jacquemont's *Letters from India*	239
Table-Talk of S. T. Coleridge	248
Mrs. Loudon's *Philanthropic Economy*	254
Woolhouse's *Essay on Musical Intervals, &c.*	290
Programmes to various Nos. to be found in their order.	

APPENDIX.

Instrument of Exchange	295
Arabs and Persians	344
Prospects of the Coloured Races	406
Stuart's *Three Years in North America*	416
Present Posture of Affairs	430
Banim's *Canvassing*	447
Extract from Article on *Military Law*	463
Extract from Article on *Sugar without Slavery*	464
Miscellaneous Extracts from Westminster Review	466

VOL. IV.

	Page
Sierra Leone.—1808	1
On Morals and Law.—1813	4
What is a Constitution?—1814	23
What is a Rightful Government?—1815	26
Treaty in Persian Gulph. 1820. (Copy in Arabic and English).	29
Correspondence on Slavery, &c. (Arabic and English)	40
Respective Values of a good and bad Harvest.—1830	44
Letter to Earl Grey on the Adjustment of the House of Peers.—1831	47
Letters of a Representative to his Constituents, during the Session of 1836	61
Do. during the Session of 1837	195
Collections of Addresses, &c. 1837—1840	303
Lectures on various subjects	365
The True Theory of Rent (Pamphlet republished)	399
Catechism on the Corn Laws (Pamphlet republished)	459
Mirage on a Heated Wall in Greenwich Park	580

VOL. V.

Letters to various Journals, between March 1840 and the end of the year 1

The Letters being orderly arranged, and the subjects stated in the running head at the top of the page, it seems unnecessary to do more here.

VOL. VI.

Letters to various Journals, in the years 1841 and 1842 . . 1
Addenda. Geometrical 43

ERRATA.

In Vol. I. p. 368, *line* 25, *for* nigh *read* high.

In Vol. II. p. 136, *line* 5, *for* Chapter XVII *read* Chapter XIII
p. 224, head line, for *Supplement to Article on* read *Supplement to Article on Silk and Glove Trades.*

In Vol. III. p. 433, *line* 35, dele * at the end.

In Vol. VI. p. 67 *and p.* 90, two Letters to the *Editor of the Statesman* are transposed; as is apparent from the dates.

END OF INDEX.

The originals of the following Letters were published, in the newspapers to the Editors of which they are found addressed. Where letters to several were in the same week, they are arranged alphabetically, according to the place of publication when that makes part of the title of the newspaper, and according to the name of the newspaper when it does not; without attention to the priority of dates in the same week.

The liberty of correction and addition has been used, as in other cases of a Second Edition.

The letters in the *Leeds Times* were not numbered till several had appeared; and then, upon a miscalculation, they were numbered three too many, which is mentioned to prevent possible misconstructions, and is corrected here.—1841.

LETTERS.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. I.

On Machinery.

Sir,—I cannot help thinking you take a too unfavourable view of the dangers arising from machinery; and that this proceeds from not giving sufficient importance to what may be called the *compensatory* part of the process, as established by nature or the actual constitution of things. Take, for instance, the case of yourself, who receive a pair of stockings woven by machinery for two shillings, where three would have been given to a knitter. Here, you say, is manifestly three shillings' worth of ruin and starvation to knitters. Granted there is three shillings loss to the individual who would have knit and did not. But see what are the compensations. In the first place two shillings go manifestly to a weaver of stockings, instead of a knitter; which is only a transfer, and as far as two shillings go, makes a balance in the aggregate. Next, with respect to the one shilling which is the difference of price,—do you who are the wearer of stockings, or do you not, expend that shilling on somebody or other to his satisfaction and benefit, where you could not have expended it if you had been obliged per force to give it to the knitter; and does not this gain to the tradesman so employed, in the aggregate balance the loss of the third shilling to the knitter,—and does not this, added to the other, make a complete balance to trade in the aggregate, with respect to the whole three shillings? And besides all this, have not you, the wearer of stockings, the comfort, satisfaction, and gain, of having had something for your third shilling instead of nothing? For example, if you laid it out in an additional pound of beef-steaks, have not you

and your family who helped to eat them, gained the beefsteaks? If you liked to publish this in your paper, and invite answers, I should wait with anxiety to see to what point of the argument the answer would be directed.

It appears to me therefore, that the vast increase of the products of industry which has made the difference between civilized men and savages, has been mainly effected through a process in which there was a continual succession of losses to certain individuals, overbalanced at each separate act by greater gains to certain other individuals, the individuals originally losing being themselves in the end involved, if not to a perfect extent, yet to a very great and considerable extent, in the ultimate gains. The knitter finds his trade a losing one, and he or his posterity is obliged to take to something else. But he and his posterity cannot help finding in the end, that they have a share with others in that increased facility of obtaining useful things, which (to borrow Adam Smith's illustration) makes a modern tradesman more cleanly dressed and better lighted, than the barbarian Emperor who has absolute command over the lives and fortunes of a million of slaves.

On the question of what is to come hereafter, I find equal grounds for comfort, and for believing that you have taken the too melancholy view. The world is before us to be filled. We are to make stockings, not only for the feet that are, but for all the little feet that are to be. In fact the case seems to reduce itself to this;—That so long as we can keep open the way to obtain food and the first necessaries of life from places capable of growing them, we are in a situation not very remote from that of our first parents, or of our second set of ancestors at the flood, and that there is not much more substantial reason for our checking present exertion or abandoning present hope, through the dread of what may befall us and ours when the world shall be filled up. Suppose it done, and posterity would only be where we should be now if we refused to eat of the feast that is set before us.

On the other subject, all I can say is this. If you gave me the power of causing the unrepresented classes to go exactly by my directions,—if you placed me at the head of their battalion to say turn to the right or turn to the left, and be praised or blamed afterwards according to the consequences,—on the best consideration of the matter within my reach, I would say, *Get any extension of the Suffrage that you can.* Go with anybody that will go with you, though it be but to gain an inch. For every inch you gain, especially at the present moment, is breaking through the notion that you are not

to go any further at all, and making it easier to demand and obtain another step when the time comes. Not that I am unaware, that there is also a degree of danger on the other side, consisting in the fact that the more are admitted to the Suffrage, the fewer are left to take part with those who are left out. But then the question arises, Do you expect to carry the whole at a sweep; or if you do expect, are your expectations likely to be fulfilled? And above all, are they *so* likely, as to warrant refusing all the chances of what can be gained by going with those who are willing to go? My own leaning is to go with all that will; at the same time never losing an opportunity of declaring and impressing, that Universal Suffrage is the only thing that has universal honesty in it,—that it is what the matter must come to in the end,—and that we view all steps as only preparatory to it.

On a different question, that of the duration of Parliaments, I should be disposed to take what to some may appear to be the unreasonably opposite course. But the fact is, that on the question of the duration of Parliaments, I see *great* danger of one of those concessions whose effect is to prevent further demands, and do not see it on the question of the Suffrage. On the duration of Parliaments, I would utterly oppose Quinquennial Parliaments, as an intended fraud, a net set in the sight of the bird, for the express purpose of getting rid of the question, and throwing an interminable interval before its renewed agitation. And Triennial Parliaments I would only consent to, on condition that a third of the members should go out annually; which with the addition of Mr. Roebuck's proposal that parliaments should be indissoluble, might make a system calculated for good and not for evil. The absurdity of chusing a set of men, and saying, Be rulers for us for the next three years, whatever may happen, and without giving us the opportunity of sending new voices among you to so much as utter the actual feelings of the community,—is one of those grossnesses which would be tolerated no where but in politics, which, meaning everybody's business, are treated as being nobody's.

Yours very sincerely,

T. PERRONET THOMPSON.

Clifton, 17 *March*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. II.

THE MACHINERY AND LABOUR QUESTION.

SIR,—It certainly cannot be said that the spirits did not come when I did call for them; an evidence, perhaps, you will tell me, that the calling had better have been left alone. However, I must only answer to the best of my ability; trusting that on one side or other or both, we shall get new light.

When Mr. Brook maintains that the use of machinery may be *carried too far*, I should be disposed to change the phrase into *carried too fast*. And even this must have a reference to the circumstances which are allowed to co-exist. If a man complains that the world goes too fast for him, and it turns out on examination that he has one leg tied up; it may be true enough he is behind, but the main fault is with those that tied up the leg, or with himself if he joined in asking for it. Now the fact seems to be, that the working classes, or some of them, *have* asked to have their leg tied up, or at all events to have it kept so, and that this request of theirs has been made by their enemies into the great excuse and reason, why the leg is not let down nor like to be.

The following is something like a statement of the facts. Machinery was from time to time throwing a certain proportion, say 10 per cent., of Leeds operatives out of employ. But at the same time, the cheapening of goods arising from this introduction of machinery, was (or if things had been left free, would have been) inducing a new demand from the customers of Leeds men abroad, which would increase the whole demand by, it may be, ten per cent., or it may be, a good deal more. If it was ten per cent., then the Leeds operatives would have been where they were at first; but if it was more, then they would have been better. And there is no reason upon earth why it should not be more, and a great deal more; for those who know anything of markets, know that a very small difference of price is sufficient to turn the scale in favour of a particular set of dealers or against them, to a very large extent. Here, then, steps in the Leeds man's enemy, and says, "You may send your goods abroad, but you shall not bring back the kind of goods that would pay. Anything but that, you may bring; but that would interfere with our monopoly. So do not be greedy; look at *us*. Do not desire any increase of the demand

for your Leeds goods abroad; sit down under what diminution of employment may befall you from the introduction of machinery or anything else, and do not cast a longing eye upon an increase of demand for machine-made cloth, for that you shall not have. We sit in parliament to watch over the commerce of this commercial country, and if we cannot hinder *that*, what *can* we hinder?" And the worst is that the Leeds man gives in to this;—that he cries out "Tie up our leg, we beseech you," or which comes to the same thing, "Do not let it down." He begs that reflection may be had, on what would be his condition if the sale of Leeds cloths were free. He prays that he may not be ruined by the demand there would be for Leeds cloths abroad, if he had not friends to hinder it.

And the reason he has for his outcry is mainly as follows.— His town is besieged, and of course wages in it rise so as to give the operatives a somewhat better chance of bidding for the diminished quantity of food than they would have had without it; though nobody but himself ever thought they could rise till they gave the operatives as much out of the reduced quantity of food as out of the full. At last there is some talk of an end to the state of siege. Whereupon the monopolists who have an interest in siege prices, run about among the operatives and cry "Is it possible you can think of putting an end to the state of siege? Do not you see it is all a trick to lower wages? Is there one of you that expects that siege wages are to continue after the siege is at an end?" And some graver than the rest, go about declaring that they have conversed with master tradesmen, and clearly ascertained from their own confession, that the expectation of wages being lowered is one reason why they wish to see an end to the state of siege. The explanation of all this *little boy*-ishness being simply this,—that siege wages are to be more money and less food for it in the market, and open-door wages are to be less money and more food. Of course the master tradesmen expect money wages to fall; it would be a prodigious blunder if they did not. But prodigious gulls would the operatives be, who should run about crying "For heaven's sake keep us in our state of siege; it is what gives us bread; we live by half-loaves; if there were whole ones we should starve; we know our masters would eat them all; we see through their cunning plan, which is to let bread into the town to lower wages till we get none of it; if you love us and our children, preserve us our state of siege, or we shall all be found starved for want of keeping out bread."

Now, when men plunge into this huge mistake at the asking

of their enemies, there is very little use in debating with them the minor questions involved in the various other ways in which the introduction of machinery brings about its own compensation, and on the whole, final gain. They were stated in my former letter, and it would be only a repetition to give them again. At the same time, note that there is no attempt at denying that the introduction of machinery brings with it from time to time individual suffering, and sometimes the suffering of masses together. Exactly the same thing takes place, when a man who can create commodities by a roundabout and expensive process at home, finds himself superseded by somebody who discovers that he can procure the same goods cheaper and better by foreign commerce from abroad. The individual suffering is not denied; but the reason why it must be borne with patience, is that every act of this kind is attended with double gains to some other persons, or to society in the aggregate; one consequence of which, to omit the others, is that the process is one which never *was* hindered and never *will* be, any more than there would have been a chance of putting down the man who invented spades, by telling him what damage he would bring upon the people who had been employed to scratch the ground with their nails. And if it cannot be hindered and will not be hindered, then all the trouble that individuals throw away upon it, is so much running their heads against a stone wall, particularly if it be accompanied with a refusal or neglect to throw open those means of compensation, which in a state of freedom would be going on at the same time.

Will you allow me to state again, at the hazard of repeating myself, that the reason why the working classes, or such of them as tried, have never been able and never will be, to prevent or sensibly check the progress of obtaining goods by foreign commerce when it can be done cheaper than they can be made at home, or of fabricating goods by machinery when it can be done cheaper than by hand, is in both cases exactly the same;—namely, that if gain is running out at one hole, it is running in at two,—that if there is one set of people who are undeniably losing and suffering by the change till they can get taken up again by its consequences, there are two sets of people who are each gaining to the same amount, among whom the former set, if they knew it, to a considerable extent at least, are sharers,—and consequently that it is as unreasonable to expect prevention permanently to go on, as to expect that every single man in the street should preserve the privilege of jostling every two men he met together off the pave-

ment, and nobody find out that this was a privilege to be put down. I upheld this doctrine, when of the men calling themselves political economists, none supported me and some laughed at me; and I am not likely to withdraw it now, when it has made considerable advances in public acceptation. But what I would impress on the working classes if I could, is that they should not waste their time in resisting, what there is no more use in resisting than the fact that man is born into the world with sorrow. It is part of nature's ordinances, that through this evil should come what good we have; and one great use of knowledge on such points, is to save us from bootless murmurings and struggles against what cannot be altered, and direct our efforts to quarters where evil may be counteracted or good produced.

After being diffuse on what appeared an important general view of the question, I must of necessity be brief in answering to particulars. When it is objected "that all men do not spend the last shilling, some save it;" I would ask whether saving is anything but giving it to be spent by somebody else. After the Revolution of the Three Days, some of the royalists started a plan for *not spending their incomes* in revenge; of which, it is surmised, nobody permanently felt the effects except their heirs.

The knitter of stockings must use his wits to get himself into some of the other modes of employment in which the demand will be increased by the very fact that somebody has less money to expend on stockings and more on something else. And if he finds it difficult, the last thing he must do, if he has wits at all, is to sit down in the hope that he shall be met by a law prohibiting society from the advantage of making its stockings by machinery, in order that he may knit them. It might be popular to tell him the contrary; but it would not be true.

And here again we are met by the old fact, that the artificial restraints on trade are the practical, substantial causes of the misery that is felt. The working classes are to have all blanks and no prizes, or they are to have the blanks without the prizes. They are to stand the risk of all the suffering that may be brought on them from time to time by the progress of machinery and other inevitable causes; but they are to be cut off from nature's remedy, by which these temporary evils would be turned into greater good. What old woman would care for being cut off from knitting, and made to go charring, it may be, instead,—if all her boys were in demand to go to sea, and all her girls to well-paid manufacturing labour? But

the old woman is to be cut off from knitting, and from the other too. The first is by the act of God and the constitution of things; the other by act of Parliament.

It will be a long time before the "machine-mongers" are persuaded, that the use of machinery "contains the germs of their own destruction." Every man is a machine-monger when the question is of himself. The man that uses a small-tooth comb is a machine-monger. They have no such machines in Portugal; and it is presumable, ought to hire more nursery-maids in consequence.

That "for every workman that is thrown out of employment, by whatever means, we lose a customer," I am afraid is what the learned call an argument in a circle. No man is found employing more workmen than he wants, in order that he may have their custom. If it would answer, why is it that nobody finds it out?

Once more, the way to "arrange that the honest industrious man shall not suffer, but always have the means of obtaining an honest livelihood for himself and family," is to keep open the door for trade and commerce to spread themselves abroad and replenish the earth; and not to allow the door to be shut first and swear it shall be kept so, and then stand grumbling at what comes afterwards.

For your "other correspondent who takes the ordinary view of the question," I cannot help saying, that he appears to have all the advantage on his side, which arises from its being very difficult to prevent the truth from making way where great numbers are interested in the search.

A WORKING MAN proceeds to sift my statement of the different transfers which take place when a commodity is cheapened by machinery; and like all my friends of the working-classes I have chanced to meet in print, he leaves out the most important part. He tells me that I (whom he chuses to put in the place of the consumer, as if the working classes were no consumers to any extent themselves,) may benefit by getting two articles for my money where I formerly got but one; but that this is no comfort to the workman who is thrown out of employment by the change. But he makes no mention of my having said, that there was *another working man* besides, who was benefited to exactly the same amount the other was damaged; so that supposing we and all the consumers upon earth (working classes included, to the extent to which they are consumers) to be just nobody at all, and to have no right to grumble at whether we get anything for our money or do not,—the scheme amounts to nothing more, than taking out of

one working-man's pocket to put into another's. But when it is taken into account that the working classes are, to a certain extent though not the greatest extent, consumers too,—the whole amounts to no more than a plan for enabling the working classes to get rich by taking halfpence out of one another's pockets, with the additional bargain that every now and then a halfpenny shall be thrown into the sea.

And here again may be noted an instance in which the working classes run into mistake by making exaggerated pictures, and throwing away their commiseration in the wrong place, instead of bestowing it upon their real sufferings. They always paint the man whose trade is slackened either by the introduction of machinery or of foreign commerce, as a man utterly and irretrievably ruined with all his dependents and connexions to the remotest degree; nay, he is always going about by hundreds, if not by thousands, parading his misery like the London gardeners when they protest against a frost. But not a word do they say, of the comfort and convenience it is to other members of the operative class, to be refreshed and called into employment by the fillip, at least equal, given to them by the change. And what is more important still, they never say a word on the fact, that these changes, if it was not for the restrictions of various kinds imposed by the thick-headed portion of society who are born to the power of making laws, would be comparatively gradual and harmless, and in real matter of fact are so at present, to an extent which their representation is unfair in overlooking.

One way of putting the case which might throw light upon the subject, would be to suppose somebody presenting himself to the operatives engaged in some branch connected with machinery or foreign commerce,—as for instance, the weavers of stockings for exportation,—and trying to impress on them the duty of giving up their trade for the sake of the good it might do to somebody else. And the weavers shall not be hard-hearted knaves, determined to get all they can and keep all they get; but they shall frankly avow themselves ready to come down from their stools, whenever it is proved to them that it would be for the general good. And first our pleader would say to them, "Give up weaving stockings for two shillings a pair, and there must immediately a set of old women be employed to knit them for three; surely you perceive the Christian duty." To which the weaver would be very likely to reply by asking, "Two shillings against two shillings, why are the old women to be preferred to us? Why are we to get off our stools, that the old women may get on? And with respect to

the third shilling, is that to be taken from nobody's custom either? My aunt, who is another old woman, keeps a chandler's shop; and surely, if her customers must give a shilling more for a pair of stockings, they must lay out a shilling less with her or with somebody else. Old woman against old woman, why is not my aunt as good as another? But besides all this, it seems to me, that my aunt's customer is to go without her chandlery: so that here is another old woman still, who is grumbling for the loss of bacon or of butter, in consequence of your philanthropic invention. So that, putting all ends together, it appears to us that your invitation amounts to neither more nor less, than that we would come down from our stools for the sake of a balance of one shilling damage to old women. We really see nothing else; we are perfectly willing to throw our own trade into the fire for the public convenience, but we cannot understand doing it for the sake of a balance of a shilling damage on the whole." And in all this there would be reason, till somebody can show not.

I fear there may be mistake in the astonishment and surprise, with which one of the working classes reflects upon the fact, that "there is plenty of land lying waste, which might be successfully cultivated by his skill and labour," with the addition of the further circumstance, "that there is plenty of capital either misapplied, or not employed at all, which might be beneficially embarked in such an undertaking." What would he say to an agricultural labourer, who was found surmising that it was all for want of making use of the advantages before them, that the manufacturers did not make broad cloth and waistcoat-pieces, twice as many and twice as cheap as they are made at present? Would he not tell him that all men are only too eager to do what they can for themselves; and if the agricultural classes cannot turn the land to more advantage than is done, it is not likely the manufacturer, if he attempted it, would do it better? But, above all things, let the working classes beware of talking of a *home market* customer. A home market customer means, one who will give them two pecks of corn for a day's work where a foreigner will give three. But these are the sounding terms, leading to arguments in circles, by which the working classes are led to do their enemies' bidding.

It would certainly have been a gross fallacy if I had said, that because a man had lived one hundred years, therefore he would live another; but not so to have said, that because there were men who lived a hundred years in times past, there probably would be hereafter. The whole question turns

upon whether the grounds assumed are good or bad. Now though it is true that our legislators have done all that was in men's power to make us a little nation instead of a great one, and a poor instead of a rich, there may be portions of good which have escaped from legislative skill, and these portions may be worth saving if we can. It is quite true that the trade which ought to have made the wealth of us and our children, has been taken from us by direct design, and given to America, Russia, Belgium, and France; but it does not follow that we have any better chance left, than to pick up the crumbs where we might have been the principals in the feast, and make the best of what our lords and masters have left us because they could not help it.

As to saying "Emigrate," all I have to observe is, "You are fools if you do." That a people who love their country, and might have a country worth loving, should fall into the snare of quitting it to make a valve for their enemy's convenience, and help him to keep up the highest pressure consistent with his safety,—is one of those phænomena which reasonable men would not believe in if they did not see it. And then to see how the spirit of making a property of the working classes, goes on board ship with you if you emigrate. Every man who has known anything of colonization either by study or experiment, from Adam Smith upwards and downwards, knew that the one great stimulus which is to lead men to overcome the difficulties attendant on all new settlements, is the facility of acquiring land, and the prospect that if an individual has the luck to force his way, he will be rewarded by finding himself the possessor of at least a plentiful supply of land, with the chance of all that may be made of it for himself or his successors. And this is precisely the chance which is to be cut off from the working-class emigrant. He is to engage to be a hewer of wood and drawer of water, till he can find money to purchase land at an artificially high price. And the pretext for this (for everything depends on a long word) is *concentration*. That is to say, the prosperity that might have spread itself over fifty square miles, is to be cut down to one-third and packed into five, because the half-pay ladies and gentlemen like to have fresh butter at their doors. It is the same system that is to be applied to the emancipated negroes we have paid for; they are to be kept from getting land, in order that they may be obliged to work, not for themselves but for somebody else. This is the mystery of colonial *concentration*. Stay where you are, simple people; and if you cannot keep yourselves out of the clutches of one mystification

at home, do not voluntarily put yourselves into the way of another abroad.

RES-PUBLICA shall be a citizen representative when the time comes. But, in the meanwhile, I cannot help being at issue with him on some of his expectations. I am afraid men will always relish a pound of beef-steaks that they can save, especially when they have the consciousness, that if in saving it they took it away from one man, they gave it to another. And why, when the question is of general want, should not beef-steaks be saved? Still more, why should we call out for an enactment which shall give a pound of beef-steaks to one man by dint of taking away two from somebody else? Who is to be the lucky man: and who is to be the man who will consent to lose; and above all, why is a pound of beef-steaks to be struck out of the national frying-pan by way of feeding the nation? Surely there will be obstacles found in the way of this kind of legislation.

For "*in the end*," Res-Publica, if he will consent, may substitute, "*on the whole*." It is an end that is always with us. It is taking place every day, and every hour of the day. It is, in truth, part of the fallacy of exaggeration formerly alluded to, which skips the fact, that the compensations in question, instead of coming at the end of this century or the next, are falling on us from moment to moment whether we perceive it or not, or the whole world would have been in ruin long ago by reason of machinery and foreign trade.

We all hate surface remedies; but the question still remains, of what is not. One man thinks all depends on putting down machinery. Another thinks the evil would be cured by taking the interest of the national debt out of one man's pocket and putting it into another's. Another thinks the working classes would be saved, if they were employed by the payers of the taxes instead of by the aristocracy. Another sees no great harm in shutting up the rats in a cage, and thinks all would be cured if they had only a ten-hours' bill. And another believes that all these causes are at work at once, and therefore there is little use in trying to cure any one. For my own part, I have no faith in dying of complications of disorders; and would cheerfully bet, that it turns out there was one great remedy, to which the others were comparatively as insignificant, as holding smelling-bottles to a man's nose when the fact is he is hanging by the neck and wants cutting down. It is easy to be facetious upon "men with one idea;" but, in a case like this, the odds are, the one idea would be right.

I should be sorry to oppose myself to an authority like Mr.

Sharman Crawford's, further than by representing that a fluctuation in employment, sometimes better and sometimes worse, appears to be inseparable from all and every kind of industry, whether of master or of man. How far either, but particularly the operative classes, shall demand and obtain a rate of wages sufficient to enable them to lay up something against a rainy day, and so set off the better times against the worse, must depend mainly, I should apprehend, on the general spread of habits of economy and forecast. If men in general will consent to work for a bare living in good times, and go to the poor-house in bad, it will be very difficult, if not impossible, for better-minded individuals to struggle against the stream. Instead of a large portion of the community "not constantly employed" at hired labour, I should feel disposed to propose to read, "not always adequately employed or in the fullest manner;" but I do not feel confident of any grand general results from partially employing the manufacturing population upon land. I do not deny the possibility of both comfort and profit arising to the manufacturer who can spend his leisure hours in gardening; but I doubt its turning out a cure for national misery on a great scale. The let-down to what is known as the "cottage and cow system," has always been, that though there was no denying it made one rat comfortable, there was no proving that it did not do this by the operation of throwing an increased share of discomfort on the other inhabitants of the cage. There was no demonstrated tendency to create an alteration in the aggregate, in the balance existing between the wants of the community and the means of supplying them; or at all events there was not tendency enough, to effect any great purpose by itself. As an accessory, it might be good; as a cure for national evil, it was perhaps a little like telling the working classes of the benefits of rubbing with a flesh-brush. And besides, there is great reason to fear,—and there is no use in blinking a fact because we do not like it,—that by the constitution of things which none of us can alter, there is the same sort of premium on working upon the large scale in agriculture, as in manufactures. In one as in the other, there is a constant tendency for the great labourers to work out the little ones. It may be very improper; but if it is so, we shall not help the small occupants by talking of it. It is highly satisfactory to an old and constant opposer of the New Poor Law, to find the authority of Mr. Sharman Crawford for the persuasion, that "if the New Poor Law stand, the Corn Law must give way." I wish there had been intelligence and courage in the classes of

society concerned, to have resisted the imposition of the New Poor Law at all, unless preceded, or at least accompanied, by the removal of the Corn Laws. It was letting the fox run away with the goose first, for the chance of persuading him to bring it back again afterwards. As the goose is gone, all that is left us is to see whether we can do anything with the fox.

I have now only to try to impress upon the working-classes, what I think they are not indisposed to believe, that in this matter I have no interest opposed to theirs, and least of all, any interest by concert with the masters. As evidence of it, am I not at this moment proscribed and libelled by the masters, because, first, I opposed, and successfully, the introduction of the No Further Reform compact into Marylebone, and secondly, showed signs of sticking by the cause of the unrepresented longer than some others? I hardly ever did an honest thing in my life, that has not been thrown in my face by innuendo or otherwise, as if it was some darkling crime, and the funds of the Anti-Corn-Law associators applied to pay for it. But this makes no reason why I should recommend the working-classes to damage themselves, because to do the contrary would serve their masters too. The coincidence is accidental, and may never happen again. I want the working-classes to get political power, that they may be able to take care of themselves whether it happens to be the interest of somebody else or not.

Clifton, 31 *March*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. III.

Comparative Facility of obtaining Universal Suffrage, or the Repeal of the Corn Laws.

Sir,—I no more expect to obtain the repeal of the Corn Laws with the present House of Commons, than to obtain Universal Suffrage. But I cannot help thinking we are much farther advanced towards obtaining the one, if not from the present House of Commons, from one, it may be, two or three times removed, than we are the other. In the first place, we have about a third of the House of Commons in favour of the removal of the Corn Laws, and that in a House where every man, with the exception of a few droppers-in, has taken an oath that he had a pecuniary interest in preserving the im-

position. And in the Lords, we have at least enough to give the subject mouth. But on the question of Universal Suffrage, after striking off those who affect to give it a hearing in the confidence that it will make no further way, how many are there in the Commons who dare avow that they maintain the popular right; are there twenty, or are there ten? And in the Lords, are there one, two, or three? It seems to me therefore, that, numerically at least, our advance towards success in the one case, is on the lowest computation ten times as great as in the other. But besides this, there is the second consideration, that a good half, perhaps two-thirds, of the wealthy and powerful, either see or are in the way of seeing, the deep interest they and the nation at large have in making Great Britain a commercial country. It is impossible that either they or the working classes can be held much longer, by the arguments of men who say, "Keep fast your gates and do not give up your state of siege; for if you do, where you gain one pound in the price of bread, you will lose twenty in the price of labour;"—for to this is reducible what has been told the working classes under the heads of falling wages, and the more pompous title of "The Rights of Labour." Mr. Middleton therefore must excuse me if I say, that for the same reason that I would push the question of Universal Suffrage if the circumstances were inverted, I would push the other of the Corn Laws now.

The fact seems to me to be, that so far from the people having at this moment any power of carrying the question of Universal Suffrage, they have hardly got the length of being able to send a single member to the House of Commons, on the sole and unaided ground of his being a supporter of that popular right. There may be individuals who are sent for other qualities, in spite of the difficulty arising from their being friends of Universal Suffrage; but if there is any man sent for that cause solely or mainly, it is not so easy to pick him out. As an instance how totally the labouring classes are without instruments in that House,—when on a late occasion the Emigration plan was introduced there, (meaning the plan whereby the working man is to be hindered from obtaining land in the colonies on the same principle as the negro,) not a man, so far as I know, peeped or muttered. There might be benevolent persons there who loved the working classes *par parenthèse;* but, to speak professionally, the working classes had not a corporal's picket of their own,—they had not a single man on duty *for* the working classes, and because he was sent *by* the working classes. If they had more than I heard of, so

much the better; but there is, at all events, no denying that the number was small to trust to, as the means of carrying the objects of the working classes. I am afraid therefore I must hold to my old opinion, that we ought to have cut short the enemy in his plan for living on us; where we had half the country at our backs.

Reading, 7 April, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. IV.

THE WORKING MAN'S QUESTION.—FREE LABOUR AND FREE FOOD.

SIR,—I proceed to answer again, as well as I am able; rejoicing much in the tone the discussion has assumed, and the inferences to be drawn from it. Let any disinterested spectator weigh the temper and style of argument of the working classes, and compare them, for instance, with those of a Tory leader, and say on which side the absence of shuffling, of wriggling, and of face-pulling, portends that power will finally remain. Viewing the working classes as the young blood of England (*la jeune Angleterre*, as our neighbours would express it), who are to rectify and redeem the errors of the old, I have no ambition but to try how far I can bring myself into a capacity to advance their honest cause.

I never meant to say, as RES-PUBLICA has got it, that if machinery inflicts suffering upon a man to-day, it does him justice to-morrow. I said there was an advantage equal to double the loss, spread over the community at large in consequence, and that it was vain and useless for the loser to think to stop the progress of such a process. I said too, that his own estimate of his loss was often exaggerated, and did not contain sufficient allowance for the degrees in which compensation of various kinds was ultimately extended to himself; and, above all, that he erred in not referring his sufferings more distinctly to the great practical cause which makes them to accumulate, the repression of industry by refusing it the liberty of exchange.

Five hundred years ago, the population of England provided themselves with a sufficiency of food and clothing, not because they used hand-labour and were without steam-power, but because they were few in comparison of the means of obtaining corn. The land that easily grows corn, was there to work upon as it was wanted. When the people grew to be

three or four times as many, the landlords prohibited foreign supply, that the people might bid higher with their bones and sinews for what could be grown at home.

When it is presented as a natural consequence, that because the English people are possessed of thirty times as much productive power as the people of five hundred years ago, therefore we ought individually to possess thirty times as much of the comforts and luxuries of life as our ancestors did,—the first striking omission is, "if there was nobody to hinder it." There are plenty to hinder it; there are the landlords, who are at this moment sitting in an assembly which has taken an oath to possessing a landlord's interest, and resolving by large majorities that the people's question shall not even be discussed. That no part of the working classes can procure anything *more* than a comfortable subsistence,—that large sections of them should be obliged to put up with much *less*,—that they should be compelled to give up all idea of comfort, and only obtain a bare sufficiency to maintain existence,—all this is as necessarily the consequence of the landlords' legislation, as corresponding circumstances would be in a cage of rats, if it was in the power of a *trap*-lord rat to make them breed against a limited quantity of food.

And here I will start a question for the working classes, which is in fact new to myself and struck out by the present discussion; so that if my leaning is wrong, it must not be violently blamed. Do the working classes think, that if machinery was prevented, by law or otherwise, to any extent it may please them to suppose, the state of the working classes in the aggregate would be improved? I strongly surmise it would not. There would be an equalization; such individuals as may now be labouring under entire privation of employment in consequence of the advance of machinery in particular directions, would be brought up to the possession of a share in the general division; but what that general division was, would exactly depend on what there was to be divided, as before. My belief is that the consequence would be, the employment of all the working classes, instead of (for instance) three-fourths of them as now, but at exactly three-fourths of the substantial wages now served out to the men actually employed. That four men manufactured for the landlords with their fingers, instead of three with a machine while a fourth was sent to be fattened by the Poor Law Commissioners, would not make the landlords give an ounce more corn than before. If this is true, it is conclusive as to the fact, that the well-being of the working classes in the aggregate,

neither depends on having machinery nor not having it, but on keeping open the supply of food in return for the products of industry.

But Res-Publica is only discontented with the *manner* in which the produce of the machinery is distributed. What else am I? What have I done but warn Res-Publica and his friends, against a mode of distribution which causes all the produce of the machinery to pass into the hands of the landlords for a given quantity of corn?

In what Res-Publica says next of the "beef-steaks," there seems to be some mixture of two different arguments. I advised the working classes not to try to make a pound of beef-steaks in one place by destroying two somewhere else; in reference to any proposed plan for benefiting the working classes by restrictions upon trade. If they are fond of the simile, I am quite ready to apply it elsewhere, and urge them not to let the landlords starve the public by limiting the national beef-steak to raise the price.

The great difference of opinion between Res-Publica and me, is where he says he cannot agree that "the artificial restraints on trade are the practical substantial causes of all the misery that is felt." If he will look again, he will see I did not say "all." But the reason why he doubts restrictions on trade being the substantial cause of misery here, is that men are thrown out of employment in America. Where are they not? But is not this like doubting whether rats in a cage are starved through a limited quantity of provision, because there are thin rats somewhere else? I cannot help joining heartily in the confidence of Res-Publica, that the truth will ultimately ooze out.

I never was more glad to be mistaken in my life, than in supposing A Working Man was proof that the working classes were not on my side on the question of machinery. But still, I cannot precisely settle the ground on which we stand. He volunteers the declaration, in the name of his class in general, "that to arrest or turn back the tide of mechanical progression, would dreadfully increase the social malady." And still he complains, and justly, that "we have more out of employment and wanting bread in proportion to the population, than we had when we manufactured by hand." Now is not this running directly into my conclusion, that the source of the mischief is in cutting off the good we might have, and leaving us the evil we cannot hinder;—that it is in prohibiting the exchange of the products of machinery for food, and leaving us to stand all other consequences?

I trust I have never shown a disposition to underrate the sufferings of any man. But I want to marshal the suffering classes to an effort in the direction where relief may be had, and not in the direction where it cannot. I want to persuade them off, from running after false scents, thrown out for the very purpose of leading them astray, like the red herring which the youthful Cobbett dragged before the hounds; and to lay them on the scent of the real fox whose brush we want to get.

A frost is what nobody can hinder, and everybody knew would come. If the suffering from machinery is of the like nature, no difference is made by calling the causes "social." And in this resemblance, lay the analogy with the London gardeners.

If the WORKING MAN and his associates understand the whole bearings of the question of the "stocking-weavers and old women," we are in a more hopeful way than was thought. But if they do, there are not six men in the House of Commons can say the like.

I hold to my advice, to beware of talking nonsense about a "home market." The good market is the market that gives most. Get the value of twenty shillings for your Leeds cloth abroad, and you are directly to be asked, what you have done with the market that would have given you fifteen at home. If the home market is to be the best, let it prove it.

I exult exceedingly that the WORKING MAN approves what I said of Emigration. Tell him and his associates to pass it from hand to hand, as the borderers did the fiery cross.

On the opinions that there is plenty of land both uncultivated and badly cultivated, and plenty of money or plenty of means of making it, and that from these sources we have more than sufficient of means within our command, as a people, to satisfy the wants of every member of the community,—I am afraid we must, for the present, continue at variance. Why not let Leeds men exchange their cloth for bread where it is ready grown and waiting for them; without speculating on what might be done if everybody would do what they won't?

Let W. make up his mind, that *compensation* will never be talked of for anybody but the jobbers. We are a people born to pay a million for disgraceful war, that somebody may make ten per cent. on a hundred thousand pounds engaged in smuggling, and call it commerce. We are a people trampled on in our domestic moralities and in our private honour; but we cannot help it, and must wait till we can. But this does not affect the question, whether the main reason of the sufferings from machinery accumulating till they become serious, is not

in the shutting up. Take an example. When human beings are penned together till they rot in their own excretions, as was the case on shipboard with the prisoners brought to England for resisting high treason in Canada, and afterwards thrust out privily because there was no legal charge against them,—would it be sensible or just to lay the blame on nature, for having subjected humanity to inconveniences and unpleasantnesses which angels perhaps are free from, but which it was manifestly her intention to carry off from time to time with little notoriety, and with the general result of a prosperous condition of the petty world of man;—or would the wise course be, to point with ruthless unforgiving hand to the tyranny which was the cause, in patience possessing our souls till the time when all this shall be brought to a reckoning to the last life and the last sigh? The parallel I think is fair.

London, 14 *April*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. V.

THE EMIGRATIONISTS.—NO TRANSPORTATION OF OUR LABOURERS!

SIR,—*The South Australian Record and Australian Chronicle* of the 11th of April contains an article in reference to my letter of the 31st of March, which gives me an opportunity of returning to the subject of Emigration. The following extract appears to include the substance of what has been advanced on the other side.—

"A very large proportion of the industrious and intelligent operatives of this country, are now either altogether unemployed, or the rate of wages they receive is barely sufficient to raise them and their families above absolute starvation. And whatever temporary revivals there may be in our trade and manufactures, their *numbers* MUST *ultimately increase*. There are two facts observable in the present state of our manufactures, which incontrovertibly demonstrate this necessity. The first is the system which generally prevails of extensive production with small profit; the second is the rapidly extending and increasingly effectual application of machinery to almost every department of operative industry. As an instance of the latter fact, it may be mentioned that just now a new machine is in the process of introduction into the woollen manufacture, which, according to the personal testimony of a highly intelligent individual, who is himself about to use it, will, in the process of time, throw a hundred thousand persons out of work in one district alone. What,

then, is to be done with this constantly accumulating mass of unemployed labour and deplorable misery?"

"Emigration, in our opinion, offers the only adequate remedy; and Colonel Thompson may depend upon it, adopting his own illustration, that if this safety valve be not opened, destructive explosion will, ere long, shatter the social engine to atoms. There are the unemployed labourers—their number, we say, *must* increase; are they to emigrate or starve? Are they to be conducted to new spheres of industry, to new homes of comfort, to new regions of peace, or are they to languish in misery and destitution, constituting the smouldering elements of anarchy and insurrection? This is the question. Let Colonel Thompson garble it as he please—let him obscure it by his one-sided reference to "concentration," and to "half-pay ladies and gentlemen," as he will; this, after all, is the question, and the only question—this is THE ALTERNATIVE."

What is submitted in reply to this, is that there is another resource besides the alternative asserted;—and that is, to allow men to enjoy their *old* spheres of industry, their *old* homes of comfort, their *old* regions of peace, by abolishing the unjust legislation which now prevents it. No class of men have a right to make a country untenable, and then take credit to themselves for offering the means of transportation to the inhabitants. "The land we live in, and may those who do not like it leave it!" might be a very good toast for the hedgehog in the fable, but not for the softer inmates upon whom the prickly abomination had chosen to quarter himself. Suppose we say we won't leave it, and we won't let them make it untenable either. This is the operation the people of England have now in hand; and they will perform it too, in despite of any temporary diversions made by getting a part of them to cry out for the abuse.

But there will be more than this. The working classes are getting their eyes open to the mystery of the Corn Laws, and they will next get them open to the other mystery, which is that the Colonial system in general is only a mode of supporting the oligarchy at the expense of the community, by a process like cutting boots into shoes. The North American colonies, for example, are only a machinery for taking away so many millions annually of the produce of the country's industry, to give a per-centage of it to people in power and their friends, and throw the remainder into the sea, by making the public buy bad timber at the price of good. The West Indian colonies perform precisely the same operation in respect of sugar. They are only so many "plants" (as the police phrase appears to be), of thieves too big to be hanged,—

national larcenies,—picking of pockets by Act of Parliament,—"higher-class" frauds, founded always on the pillage of the humbler. And then the government of colonies—is what no wise man would submit his dog to if he loved him. The supporters of the Emigration Gazette may think they are to be better than the rest; but who is to answer for them twenty years hence? A colony must either be kept under a perpetual tyranny, or it will cease to be a colony. All honest men in colonies live like toads under a harrow, till they can throw off the "baneful domination of the mother country;" and simply for this reason, that the whole system is organized for serving the interests, not of the honest men, but of somebody else. And then come the murders, the throat-cuttings, the massacres of prisoners by honourable assassins paid out of our purses. All this is what you are invited to go to, for yourselves or children; and all lest the landlords' steam-engine should blow up at home. Once more; stay here if you are wise. The time cannot be far off, when industry shall be free, and the man who works shall be allowed to sell the fruits of his labour, without going to the colonies for leave.

London, 15 *April*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. VI.

BREEDING FOR TRANSPORTATION.

SIR,—The *South Australian Record and Australian Chronicle* of Saturday last, contains a reply to my letter of the 15th of April; the only argument I can extract from which, is comprised in the words there given in capitals—"THINGS HAVE GONE TOO FAR—it is TOO LATE NOW." In other words, there is no use in taking the halter from the man's neck; the man is dead, and there is nothing to be done with him but pickle him for exportation.

Now to this I beg leave to demur. Though it may be undeniable that the legislation of the British land-owners has made a more extensive wreck of human comfort and national happiness than can find a parallel, under anything like similar circumstances, in the history of mankind;—and though it may be certain that the amount is almost incalculable, of what is irrecoverably gone as an example to future times and other

countries, of the consequences of an ignorant and servile people saying to a particular class "Make laws for us, and, as the means of being sure you take care of yourselves, make all the law-makers swear they belong to you;"—though all this may be past doubt or hesitation, there are many of us who believe, in spite of all ridicule which may thereto attach, that there is something which might be worth saving in British commerce still;—that if industry were allowed by law, we might mend ourselves, without being tied to the necessity of rushing into the recruiting-offices of the Emigration Committee, and screaming for the first copy of "How to get to Australia." We so far trust in this, that at all events we mean to try; and we are ready to bet anything within the limits of our moderate habits, that we "go ahead" quite as fast, as either the transporters or transported.

This must be the reply (which the *South Australian Record* may aver is none) to the arguments advanced. We think the man has life in him that might be turned to good; and we mean to try the effect of taking the rope from about his neck, before we let him go to New South Wales. We may be laughed at; but we do. And now we have a question to ask, which the Emigration Gazette will perhaps say is no question. Is it so certain, that when the money has been raised by the proposed artificial price of land, it shall ever be applied to the purposes professed; for though to raise the money and apply it, may be on the whole an evil, it does not follow that to raise it and *not* apply it would be better? What is the meaning of the following extracts from Sydney papers, which appear in this day's *Times;* in which the passages are distinguished by italics, which bear directly on the present controversy?

"The East and West Indies, the Cape, the Australian Colonies—all are suffering from the imbecile or corrupt measures of those persons and their 'liberal' nostrums. But it is useless to complain under present circumstances. Let the colonists of New South Wales be frugal and industrious; let them import their own labour, and encourage emigration; *let them, by so doing, add half a million of men to the population (taking care that each man possesses a rifle), and let those who can afford it send their sons, in the meantime, to the military schools on the European continent*—let them do this, and they will be in a condition to annihilate the power of their Whig tyrants at the first favourable opportunity. Let us take a passing glance at the whole of the policy of these people as respects the colonies; they have prevented the labour of Coolies being made available, they tampered with the transportation system until it became so unmanageable that they found themselves constrained to put a stop to it altogether; and *they have placed the emigration fund at the*

disposal of the Governor, to aid and assist in defraying the salaries of government officials, and put a stop to emigration! That, we think, is a pretty long list of the benefits conferred upon this colony by the Whigs. There can, we think, be little doubt that all *the tampering with the land fund, and its diversion from the professsed object for which it was originally raised,* may be attributed to the influence of those bubble companies which are daily starting up—companies usually formed by penniless schemers and abductionists."

Here is a promise of future felicity! A civil war in embryo already, to prevent the oligarchy from laying its claw upon the fund the "hewers of wood and drawers of water" are to raise.

London, 28 *April,* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. VII.

CHANCES OF RELIEF OF THE UNREPRESENTED CLASSES.

SIR,—I gladly close with the intimation of your readiness to admit a weekly letter from me upon subjects of public interest. Since the organs of the Lichfield House Compact (as seems to be the title the thing has acquired,—it may be presumed, from the locality which witnessed the moment of projection) did me the honour to make their first move the driving me out of parliament by sending a Tory Lord in my stead, I have been a little in the situation of the retired tallow-chandler who asked leave to come on melting-days; and the same compact carried the aristocratic portion of my Hull supporters, newspapers and all, into that state of virtual hostility to the further progress of reform, which it was the object of the contracting powers to induce. It might have been supposed, that an individual at whom such a point had been made, would have been taken up by somebody and somewhere; and that the demonstration given, that his absence was a thing to be bought at such expense, would have raised him up friends as a natural corollary to the proposition. But when I recollect, that a principal object of the Whig and Irish combination was to drown the opposition to the destruction of the most important right our fathers fought for, the Right of Supply, and that a dastardly and corrupted people (from which stigma, the class who had no votes may

consider themselves as happy in being free) had not the spirit in any one constituency to send to parliament the man who was the official agent of resistance to the treason as long as the treason could be resisted ;—when I reflect, I say, on this monstrous disgrace and national dishonour, I can easily comprehend how an individual like myself, who bore but a secondary part, and was in some respects a sort of eleventh-hour labourer in the field, should have found no support or sympathy but in the hearts of that " slave class," whose day is coming, come, and on whom Providence has devolved the duty of recovering the credit of their forefathers, and establishing the happiness of their posterity on the basis of equal laws and constitutional rule.

The main purpose, then, of our correspondence shall be, to collect whatever in the shape of history of the past or of reasonings on the future, may throw light on the actual position of the excluded classes and their chances of relief; understanding always, that we aim at no local nor limited object, but invite communication and co-operation from all quarters where the disposition is felt to make them. Enemies we trust to find, and friends we are sure of. And so God prosper the good vessel, as she shall be honestly steered and fairly handled.

To look back on old subjects—I observe we are attacked on the matter of Emigration, in the *South Australian Colonist* (which is not the same as the *South Australian Record*, for they are legion) of the 21st and 28th of April. There is little in the contents to which it is practicable to make any new reply ; and it is a good general rule, only to answer once. The attempt to pervert what I said on the subject of colonial murders, into the expression of a desire for murders here, is in the worst style of the worst cause, unless it was purely blunder, which covers a multitude of sins. I am to be borne down too, it appears, by the authority of the Member for Sheffield ;—I remember ; — the same who when the troops were treasonably turned upon the people in Canada, rejoiced in the victory of the grenadiers. I mention it, as I have a right to do, because I think the authority brought to bear upon us, will tell in our favour rather than against us. I beg to note by the way, that the " redundant population," always means the population it is for the interest of the oligarchy not to allow to keep themselves. On the whole, we seem to have flurried the transportationists. Surely I have been acquainted with the " Colonist" somewhere before. There is a flavour about his disagreeableness which seems familiar. Does he " colonize" under the wing of the

Manchester Anti-Corn-Law Association? I only ask from the most innocent of curiosities.

London, 6 *May*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. VIII.

How the People's Cause has been let down.—True Character of the Tactics of the "Tail."

Sir,—The actual position of the excluded classes is best collected from a retrospect of the events which brought them where they are. A long war, virtually for the depression of the natural progress of the principles of popular freedom which had been established by the English in their Civil War and Revolution, had been concluded with the fullest success to the anti-popular side. But in ten years, the depressed principles were found to be rapidly making head, of which what was called Catholic Emancipation was the proof; and in five years more, they received such a fillip from the ejection of the Pretender established by foreign arms in France, as enabled that portion of the aristocracy which professed attachment to Revolutionary principles in England, to take possession once more of the government. As usual in such cases, great was the unanimity among those who were not unanimous the other way; and the combining parties on this occasion might be described as three;—the part of the aristocracy who may be called the Whigs; the English population who hoped to rise in the political scale; and the Irish, who had already with the help of popular feeling in England gained the great step already named.

The parties in this triple union, for a space, liked one another well, and sat smiling in each other's faces till, as often happens elsewhere, one party began to be urgent for some of the benefits expected to result. The English "slave class" was that party, and it began to hint its wishes to see something of the further equalization of political rights which had been promised to secure its aid. And here, to cut the story short, the other two parties turned to each other and proposed a counter treaty. Which was the first tempter and which the tempted, is known probably to those only who were engaged within the grateful bower where the first approaches

were made. Or perhaps the parties came to no more formal resolutions, than in the process sometimes adopted by voyagers and natives from mutual distrust; each knew the others' wants, and so laid their wares upon a certain stone, and in silence marched off with the equivalent. And the equivalents were these;—The English Whigs were to let the Irish leader or leaders, have their own way within certain limits in Ireland; and the Irish were to say no more about the extension of new rights in England, or the invasion of old ones in Canada. On which last point the Irish had certainly the excuse, that their ancestors had been no parties to the victories by which those rights had been obtained, from the substantial circumstance that they happened to be fighting on the other side.

The results of this compact or understanding, were soon visible in all directions. The Whig government turned round on its Radical allies, and gyves and the mill were their portion, for what they had been encouraged in when it suited the Whigs to talk of "wholesome manifestations." The Irish leader proclaimed the treaty after his own manner, when he sighed gently over the Whigs, as those who, "whatever were their faults, were always the friends of Ireland." To the English Radicals he gave rougher measure; for he rushed from calling on the people of Limerick for fourteen thousand "fighting men" to frighten the Queen, to express his delight that the thirty soldiers who fired on the mistaken Radicals at Newport should be Irish, and to ask where the Canadians would go to when they die, who had dared to resist the seizing of the Supplies by a treasonable application of the military force. And thus he played at bo-peep with the devils, of which it might be supposed Ireland had known enough, and which were only waiting for temptation to pounce on her again. Just as if Irish history could not equally tell of "Ancient Britons" set on horseback to try conclusions upon Irish bones and muscles. Three hundred thousand Irish, too, were liberally offered to put down any vagaries the people on this side the water might fall into;—as if "Colkitto's myrmidons" had ever told for much in an English civil war. But thus it is the people's cause is let down on different sides alternately, by the defection of those who assume to be its leaders.

Here then the case at present stands. The Irish "tail" has sold the English people; and a huge English "tail" of different denominations, has either joined, or hopes to do it by-and-by. All further progress of Reform is at an end for this tide. The tide must go down again, and after that, we must see what comes next.

Two things, at this conjuncture, are to be recommended to the English people. One is, to look on with the greatest coolness, at the danger which is overtaking the Irish from the course their leaders have chosen to pursue. The natural consequence of the hostile attitude in which they placed themselves with the English Radicals, is that their enemies have taken heart to attack them at home, and to strike directly at the existence of the parliamentary influence which, with the assistance of the English, they had obtained. Let it work. As men sow, so must they reap; no man can sow desertion and reap strength. Let us look on quietly at the Irish being put down, as it is possible enough they may be; and another time they will know better than to barter their English allies for the first piece of gingerbread offered them in the shape of the appointment of a Lord-Lieutenant. What will come afterwards, will be a new advance of the English and Irish people together, under leaders too wise to sell, and too skilful to betray.

The next point will be, to set stoutly about turning out and keeping out, all that comes under the description of English "tail." Suspect any man that ever called himself "a good reformer;" the words, being translated, meant a man who had given himself up to the prevention of all further Reform. Doubt equally, whoever has been heard to whisper such a phrase as "keeping out the Tories;" set him down instantly for one who was over head in the plot, for giving a Whig government full license to copy a Tory one, within at most the turning of the scale. We have been contracted for; but as an election is the time when for a brief space the pitch-plaster is off our eyes, let us be prepared to strike out for the chance of disappointing the assembled dissectors of their game. The moment may arrive to-morrow; no man knows but he may meet it when he next goes out of his house. What we can do, is to be ready. How we should make ready, shall be the subject of the next.

London, 13 *May*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. IX.

RADICAL POLICY AT ELECTIONS.—THE "PARTITION PRINCIPLE."

SIR,—The power in the hands of the friends of the Unrepresented, consists in the opportunities a small but active minority has of interfering between two hostile parties of greater magnitude which are nearly balanced between themselves. It is a year

since I endeavoured to place this before the public under the title of the "Partition Principle," (See *Weekly True Sun* of 26th May 1839, and other dates); and I can perhaps now go over the ground again, with some improvements the result of further attention to the subject.

The grand chance then for the defenders of the people's cause, is in those constituencies where two members are sent to parliament, and the great parties of Whigs and Tories are pretty equally balanced. It is a curious instance of the desirableness of verifying theories by experiment, that this double representation, against which a strong set was made by many well-meaning individuals at the time of the Reform Bill, should be found forming the last shelter for the defenders of Reform.

In every place circumstanced as described, the friends of the Unrepresented have the power of bringing forward an almost irresistible demand for one member, if they can make up their minds to the responsibility of so much vigour, and can steel their hearts against the puling remonstrances which will be advanced against an act so savouring of sense and resolution. And remonstrances will not be all; in their communications with the betrayers of the popular cause, they must prepare themselves for being cut off from all the charities and all the decencies of life. If they are invited to a conference, they must bear in mind that it is not for them that society unites to enforce the utterance of truth, and that the grossest breaches of veracity and personal faith will find support from individuals of every shade of pretension to the title of honourable men, when a friend of the unrepresented is to be the subject of the fraud. If they think they have made a political alliance, let them be sure that within eight-and-forty hours their new allies will be found creating bought votes for hostile operations; and if they come to a poll, let them send the bellman to cry down the suspected strategem, or the perjury of deputy returning-officers will refuse to record their votes, and they will be left to the remedies of that law, which like the London Tavern is always open to the rich and to the strong. In short, let them believe that they are engaged with a political party who, as a party, are unable to maintain the relations of peace and amity, or give any guarantee which a reasonable man with his eyes open would think of confiding in.

And on the other hand, let them not err by too much aversion either. It is one thing to go with an individual or a party where common interest leads, and another thing to have the

slightest confidence in anything but the existence of such a motive. Let them go then where it is their interest to go; but always with the same precaution that they would have consorted with the evil spirits of middle-age romance, bearing in mind that their companions have been deceivers from the beginning, that their object is now to deceive unless they have some palpable reason in the opposite direction, and that a union with them however temporary, is hardly to be effectually proved innocent but by success.

A powerful method of increasing the effect of such a demand as has been supposed, is for the friends of the unrepresented to bring forward two candidates of their own where it can be compassed. The Whig-Radicals (for that name is really more appropriate than the Whigs) had always rather see one candidate of their own and one Tory succeed, than one of their own and one real friend of Reform; but they had not always rather see *two* Tories. It cuts them out of local influences and opportunities, in a way they cannot endure. Now two candidates on the side of real Reform, put the screw on them much more strongly than one, in the way of obliging them to either risk the result of bringing-in two Tories, or avoid it by conceding one seat on the condition of support in turn. And if there is only one real Reformer, the greatest portion of his voters will give their second vote to the sham Liberal, whereby the chances of the sham Liberal being at the top of the poll will be nearly as good as ever. If there had been two really reforming candidates, most of these men would have voted for both.

In the cases where a constituency sends but one member, the question becomes more complicated, and can only be settled by reference to the particular circumstances. But many of these instances admit of favourable solution. As a stimulus to all, lists are here given* of the different classes of constituencies, where from the last election returns, an opportunity appears to be presented for success. The whole number of places in the lists is 350; so that if the principle was successful in only one case in ten, it would give the Unrepresented thirty-five fair advocates in the House of Commons.

A great incentive to exertion, is to be noted in the immense sacrifices which the keeping-out of one People's Representative imposes on the enemy. To take my own case, there would be very little exaggeration in saying, that in the dead lock of

* The lists referred to, will be found in Vol. IV, page 362, of the present Work.

to-night, when heaven and earth would be compassed to gain a single vote, I might count for *ten;* that is to say, that the majority of the ministers will be ten less, or their minority ten greater, than it would have been but for the pains it has been thought worth while to take, to keep me out of the House of Commons.

I served the Hull Whigs faithfully, both with money and attendance; paid for a hostile scrutiny when none of them would help, and was one of the three members of the house (Lord John Russell and Mr. Wakley being the other two) who had attended the greatest number of divisions. And I had stoutly refused all temptations to secure a seat at the expense of the existing alliance between the Radicals and Whigs; for which I am to this moment suffering under abuse and libel from the Whig-Radicals. But when an election came, nothing would serve the Whigs of Hull but they must get me out. So they fidgeted and worried, and worked through aged relatives and in all other ways they could devise, till at last they persuaded me that my chance of re-election was so small (which, by the way, was directly contrary to the fact), that I was driven to take the chance of the more promising occasions presented elsewhere, and in which I should have been brilliantly successful, if domestic treachery (by which the greatest have fallen) had not cut me down from behind in the moment of my exaltation.

And what were the results to the Whigs? That the Radicals held back from the contest, and both seats at Hull went directly to the Tories. Two seats more in a neighbouring borough, where Whig candidates were in the field, went to the Tories by contagion. And finally, this quadruple success encouraged the Tories to set up a candidate for the county, whom they carried. And after all this, nothing would satisfy the English-Irish tail, but sending a Tory Lord into parliament with their eyes open, as the means of keeping me out of Marylebone. There were at one time six Tory members voting in the house upon the strength of the measures taken to keep me out; so that at that moment, I might be said to count *twelve* on a division. One of the seats for Hull was afterwards recovered at a great expense; which makes me to-night count only *ten*.

On the score of expenditure, there is the same kind of advantage on the people's side. The bringing-in Lord Teignmouth for Marylebone, cost the Whig-Radicals many thousand pounds; the opposition to it, cost only three hundred. It is one of the compensations nature has provided, as in the case of

the weaker animals, to prevent the race from being forced out of existence altogether.

On the whole therefore, the case is one for exertion and not for despondency. The people's cause is vastly better than was that of the Irish Catholics when ten men met in a room to take measures for their emancipation. The same proceedings would lead to the same result. When men show themselves, help comes from unexpected quarters. The condition of this world is, that all good shall be for those who stir; as the rogues well know.

The *South Australian Colonist* of yesterday, attacks me again, with the virulence of a wild cat disturbed at its meal. I cannot resist the temptation to bring it to the notice of my poorer countrymen, as an example of what the man must be dragged through, who tells them the truth.

London, 20 *May*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. X.

THE NEW TAXES.—WHERE THE PEOPLE'S MONEY GOES TO.—THE OPIUM SMUGGLING WAR.—WHIG TREATMENT OF POLITICAL PRISONERS.

SIR,—In the twenty-fifth year of peace, and under a government calling itself Liberal, we are to have new taxes. If I had not fixed upon the subject in a way that makes it inconvenient to change, I might with propriety have taken another, after the stirring remarks upon it in your last week's article. But I will confine myself to following your lead.

And here, in connexion with the necessity there is for a new Reform Bill, let me point out to you and to such possessors of electoral rights as we may influence, the total, complete, and absolute absurdity there is in the supposition, that the industrious classes of Great Britain, from whom everything must finally be drawn, can ever obtain any remission or slackening of taxation below the mark which is one degree above resistance point, under the present system. The proof of the absurdity, is in asking what the parties would be doing who are there to hinder it. The organization is purposely such, as shall ensure the prevention; it is a sort of weakness therefore to complain, of what is nothing but a consequence.

Among the stories (true enough, there is little doubt) of the

hardships of negro slavery, one was of an aged slave, who complained that when he had been successful in catching fish, a white man would meet him and take them from him. His master, he said, would sometimes interfere;—"but sometimes my master takes them, and what I must do then?" This is precisely the situation of the British people;—"*their master takes them.*" The men to whom they look for such protection as they are like to get, take the fishes and the loaves too, and divide them among their own class, and in fact virtually among themselves.

I repeat, the industrious classes would be mad to expect the smallest relaxation; for as soon as the amount of any possible saving is worth taking, there will be somebody there to take it. A few years ago, for instance, the cessation of war had caused an accumulation in the hands of ministers, which must have been of the value of something like a million and a half a-year. "Who shall have this?" as the children's game says, was the word; and it was determined to serve it out among the class of influential persons having property in the West Indies. And served out it was accordingly, under circumstances of grossness which proved the insensibility to all idea of danger in the doers;—a loan of fifteen millions proposed one night, and turned into a gift of twenty millions the next.

Nobody does things of this kind, but when they are doing for themselves. They trusted partly to the ease with which men surrender that which they are not to pay; and partly to the twaddling kind of humanity which leaped at the idea of benefiting the British slaves at the expense of riveting the chains of greater numbers all over the world, on the precise principle of the well-meaning individual in Ireland, who protested against the cruelty of sweeping chimneys with a live goose, and proposed to use a couple of ducks instead. And they not only take care there shall be no relaxation of taxes, but they block up the chance of your outgrowing the load. The possible deductions from the tax-gatherer's demand, they dispose of as they arise; and they prohibit the sale of your Leeds cloth abroad, which might improve your ability to pay. Twenty millions can be divided on the drum-head, when thirty thousands cannot be given for the education of the people; and new churches can be built out of a river's tolls, and the navigation of that river at the same time closed to foreign trade.

We are taxed at present, then, because the accumulations of the peace-savings were made over to one of the wealthy classes, under an understanding, there can be no doubt, that

they would be open to the workings of gratitude, when the time came for doing a like good turn to somebody else. And this same class, be it remembered, owed all they had, and the very purchase-money which had been paid for the slaves they were now to receive twenty millions for again, to another branch of the general system of cutting boots into shoes for the benefit of the influential classes at the people's expense. Every fragment of the wealth puffed off as West-Indian, had been made by throwing twice as much into the sea, and charging it to all the working men who sweeten their mouths with sixpenny brown. But bad as this is, it would be well if they kept to this. There is little chance of their limiting themselves to expending what they have got in hand; the labour of the child unborn must be pledged, to support the sea and land robberies of the domineering classes, and trample on our domestic notions of morality and conscience.

The damning charge against these Whigs is, that they are sinking us in the scale of civilization,—that they are pushing us back to barbarism, while other nations are moving in advance. Who would have thought that in moral, most religious England, a few smugglers of opium would have been allowed to thrust their felony into the faces of honest people, and that we should as a nation have been dragged at the heels of culprits, to whom the last that suffered at the gallows for piracy or in the hulks for shoplifting, was comparatively innocent? But so it must necessarily be, when the very men to whom the price of blood was to go, could be brought forward by a minister in the House of Commons as authority for the propriety of paying the demand. Englishmen have paid for the lady-loves of Charles the Second, and the loves which were not lady-loves of James the First; but they never paid for anything of which the infamy was so palpably spread before them as this.

And then the intense folly. All felonies might in a certain sense be recommendable, if the felons could be certain of success; but how if they chance to fail? And here lies the rub. It might to some extent answer, that we should be the tools and instruments to perpetrate robberies and murders upon a distant people in order to make pocket-money for our oligarchy, if the oligarchy were sure to succeed. But suppose their villainy and ours should be followed by the defeat which it deserves. Suppose that in some of the inscrutable ways by which the Power that rules this world preserves it from putrefaction,—discomfiture, failure, and loss should follow on this prodigious baseness. Assume that Providence should be in the disposition for "reading a moral lesson," and should in some unexpected

manner strengthen the hands of the feeble, or raise up avengers for those who had none to help them. Admit the case, as only one of what might happen, that not the unwarlike but the warlike Tartar, the lord of a million of regimented slaves who hangs over civilized Europe like a thunder-cloud, should seize the opportunity for putting himself for once into the right, and push the demand for a cessation of hostilities, as it would not be difficult for a Scythian Talleyrand to push it, to the utter exclusion of any peaceful ending. Suppose it should suit Russia and America to join in summoning us as vulgar cut-throats to the bar of national law;—would there be anything creditable or pleasant in the position?

But you would defend yourselves, you will say. You would not. You would be given up with ropes about your necks to Commissioner Lin, long before the people of England would submit to any serious privations in such a cause. The people of England, or great and influential masses of them, are a thoughtful and moral people, deeply penetrated with the superior value of the gains of honest commerce, to all that can be made by blood and bucaniering through the world; and they would hang you themselves, sooner than justice should go undone, if once you brought yourselves into the situation of being chargeable with national misfortunes, brought on in support of the smuggling of your first and second cousins abroad. AT SUCH AN HOUR, as Monro said in America, TO WHICH OF THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD OR MAN WOULD YOU TURN FOR COMPASSION?

And all this that Messrs. Pike and Pluck in the City may drive their carriages on robbery and blood. Why are the common people to be honest,—why are we the vulgar to obey the commands "Thou shalt not steal" and "Thou shalt do no murder," when our betters show us these are only cobwebs to catch the little knaves and let the great ones through? Have the clergy remonstrated, or will they? Not they; for who knows but a score of perpetual curacies may be founded on the bones of heathen women and children at Canton? But they will cant like whipt bawds, about somebody coming to "swallow us up quick," if the consequences of national villainy should descend on us in the shape of danger to the Establishment.

But Providence will read none, at least in that form. It has more refined ways to work its ends. The punishment of national crime like this, is in the growing enmity between the honest part of the community and the dishonest;—in the increasing mistrust of all the governing classes, and the spreading desire in the others to try their hands at what "might be

better, can't be worse;"—in the rapidly progressing alienation between the house of "Have" and the house of "Want;"—in brief, *the revolutionary spirit* is what these legislators, fools as they are, insist on pouring out upon the land, and it is out of this vial that heaven, improving on its ways of yore, now treats evil and bloody governors instead of thunder-bolts.

And what a wretched figure have the Radical representatives so-called, exhibited on this occasion! Except John Fielden, I cannot name the man who put his vote in opposition to this national disgrace. The salve they salved themselves withal, was this;—They said, "The Tories care nothing about the matter, and would do the same themselves; their opposition therefore is *factious*." As if it was not just as *factious*, to support ministers in a national dishonour, because an opposition tried to turn them out for it.

And then again, if a time by possibility could come, when no commercial interest could be found to accept the people's millions, and no war got up to prevent their accumulation in future, is there not always the non-national church, the "greatest enormity in Europe," waiting to divide any possible amount among the scions of the aristocracy on condition of black coats being worn to spend it in? O no; the chance is as great of sending milk to market in a sieve, as of any portion of the people's money remaining in their pockets, except what is enforced by the perilous limitation formerly described.

What then is the conclusion? That we have not any effectual control over our own purses, and that we *ought* to have. And that because we ought to have, we should take the means; such means being, the demand that the honest portion of the people who are now a "slave class," should be brought into the participation of political rights with those who less deserve them.

I said the present ministers were sinking us in the scale of civilization. Did anybody suppose a ministry dared to have put such an insult on the country as this Chinese infamy? Would anybody have believed, when they took the government into their hands, that prisoners could have been put to death in Canada, sometimes with torture, for having resisted the illegal application of the military force to put down the constitutional law established by the Revolution and the Civil War?

What is there that has been done at Spielberg, or any other of the prison-houses of the continental despots, to match the cruelties practised at home upon men charged with political

writings disagreeable to the government? The mad Paul of Russia once sent an Englishman to sweep the streets of Petersburg, for driving his carriage faster than a walk; but then he was mad, and in a few days afterwards was strangled for riddance. The continental rulers by right divine confine a political opponent; but they do not rack him hourly. They do not send him to the clergy and aristocracy's place of torment, and then say the deed is none of theirs. They do not make a visiting priest the measurer of the relief an imprisoned enemy shall receive from reading. It was left for the English Whigs to revive the spider-killing system, and pluck from miserable men the solace of a book. They have done their best to show us, how much better it is to live under a splendid despotism than a sordid oligarchy. They have laboriously broken through those conventional decencies of political hostility, which tended to humanize the contest, and shed an atmosphere of moderation over at least the educated portion of the combatants. There is not one of us, but under the present ministry, is liable any day of the week to be sent to clean felons' privies in York Castle, for a different opinion in politics. The Tories hurt nobody; they shut up their enemies, but they always deported themselves like gentlemen.

We may as well move in our defence, first as last. Stir up, as far as you are able, our friends in the West Riding, to be ready on the opportunity of an election, to help to give the "*Descendas, carnifex!*" to this resurrection of antiquated tyrannies, which like a Roman Emperor equally attacks in his personalities the knight and the plebeian, and which as it has lived only to deceive, will continue only to dishonour.

London, 26 *May*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XI.

THE SOCIALISTS.—PERSECUTION OF THEM.—APOSTACY OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.—FURTHER PURGATION OF THE CANON WANTED.—NECESSITY FOR A NEW PROTESTANTISM.

SIR,—The letter of J. B. H. in your paper of last week, presents an opportunity for entering on the subject of what is denominated social reform in contradistinction to political, or what may perhaps without unfairness be considered as expressed by the briefer phrase of "Socialism."

And here I must begin by avowing, that I am not a "So-

cialist." The opinions of the Socialists on commercial questions, and particularly on the desirableness or possibility of excluding the principle of competition, I am obliged to consider as involving the same kind of fallacy as has sometimes induced a school-boy to wonder why an unlimited commerce in apples and gingerbread could not be carried on to the advantage of all parties, if only the dealers concerned would accept pebble-stones for half-pence, and resolve with one consent to receive them from each other. There is the same overlooking of substantial reasons, why, however promising such a plan might be in the early stages, it can never in the end answer the expectations of the framers.

In their doctrine of the non-responsibility of man, though they may be far from being wholly wrong, I cannot persuade myself to think them wholly right. If the question were, whether for instance a population like that of Great Britain, forcibly retained in a situation which necessarily leads to poverty and crime, and cut off by law from the enjoyment of the fruits of honest industry, by the owners of the soil acting upon principles like those which induce the negro chieftain to look for wealth from the dispersion of his population in distant lands rather than from its employment at home,—if the question were whether individuals under such circumstances were responsible for all the crime and attendant misery generated by the system in themselves and others, the answer would be brief and easy. But I think there must be *some* responsibility for making a better or worse use of opportunities presented. Cut off the full tale of the landlords' guilt and place it to the right account, and still there must be something like a reckoning for that misconduct which made one man more wicked than another under the infliction.

And their opinions on marriage—(always bearing in mind that there may be considerable doubt how far the opinions ascribed to them, are really their opinions,—or if entertained at all, how far they are universal and essential to the being of a Socialist,—and if theoretically entertained, to what extent they are now, or are ever likely to be, carried into act)—appear to be equally contradicted by the physical fact, that as the duration of the pairing of other animals is regulated by the period necessary for the well-being of the progeny, so in the human subject the general rule plainly pointed at by the same consideration, is that the connexion should be for life. If, as I vehemently suspect, the Socialists do not either in theory or practice resist this as the general rule, but merely

hold different opinions from those which have come to be called the orthodox, upon the causes of divorce and other questions connected with the marriage state, the difference sinks into something of very minor importance, but quite enough for a rampant hierarchy to found a persecution on.

And this brings me to the reason, why, though no Socialist, I want to go with the Socialists. The *Quarterly Review* has irresistibly established the fact, that the Socialists are at this moment part and portion of the struggle for religious freedom; for what is there a man should so jealously defend, as the right of being wrong if he likes? There may be no abstract preference for the doctrines of Socialism, any more than for the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and yet men may have the sense to see, that great gratitude is due to Divine Providence when it places large masses of active individuals, whether separately right or wrong, in hostility to the grand common oppression which is in a way of rolling over us all.

The religious tyranny of the day, then, has committed itself by an attack upon the Socialists; and what I want to demonstrate to them is, that they have the power of returning the attack, with the certainty of finally working woe to the unjust assailants.

Let them look only at the position in which those assailants stand. A sect which at no distant period of our history, overturned a previously established ecclesiastical power, and spoiled its goods. And which has since done nothing but lay itself open to the same sources of complaint and weakness which led to the ruin of its predecessor; with the aggravating circumstance that the encroachments of the earlier power were made under an almost general recognition of its authority, and of the latter under a flood of protests from all quarters.

The Roman Church was a paternal authority running riot on the strength of the sons' submission, till it forced them into resistance. The Anglican which took its place, exhibits itself as an incarnation of the barbarous principle of the feudal times, which said that all property belonged to the strongest. We see a sect, (on the simple ground which might be changed to-morrow, that it contains a majority in numbers), claiming not a majority's share, but *all*, of whatever shall be levied on the pockets of the community for purposes connected with religion;—the mistake, in short, which Bentham resisted and confuted, when asked if his principle of "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" meant, that of a million white men and a million black, either was to oppress the other,

according as the accidents of population first raised the white section or the black to a preponderance of *one*.

Here, then, by itself, is manifestly a claim which cannot stand, any more than any of the thousand-and-one forms of injustice which have been strangled since the time of Hercules. But there is more than this. As where careless generals after a town is taken leave open the approaches for a new attack, so it would require nothing but following the traces of our Protestant ancestors step by step, to advance by the same parallels and march in by the same breaches.

If the Roman Church (to waive, as our fathers did, all question as to the final authenticity of the authority appealed to) set itself in opposition to its own admitted rule, and imposed burthens too heavy to be borne, in defiance of the express commands and practice of Christ and his apostles,—so does the Anglican, selecting with a curious infelicity the self-same ground or portions of it, on which our forefathers raised their batteries against the corruptions of the Papacy.

If the Papal doctors trusted to the vulgar ignorance of Greek, the Anglican bishops found their claim to divine institution on a cold-blooded mistranslation, the paltry fraud of taking a foreign word, and by a series of alterations like those in the schoolboy's derivation of "King Pippin," forming it into a new sound conveying something totally distinct from the original meaning, and then inserting it instead of the true, in places where they dare, for in some the fraud would be too clear.

If the Anglican church professes to have ejected from its canon much prurient and immoral nonsense,—such as teaching young women that they are the objects of carnal desire to evil spirits, and that their future husbands may be in danger from the jealousy of these ghostly admirers,—the University of Oxford which is the church's executive and part of its monopoly, prints the indecent trash for the edification of the cottage and the school-room, and presents it in the same volume with the scriptures at large. Does the University of Oxford believe this lust of evil spirits to be a truth? If it does, is it fit to be the dispenser of a nation's faith? Does it know it to be an unclean falsehood? If it does, is it any fitter for the office than before?

But if the Anglican church did some service by what it affected to repudiate, it left enough undone to prove, that hostility to contested doctrines, rather than a care for public morals, was the moving power which directed. It still preserves in its canon a whole book, of which it dares not read a

verse among the lessons of the day ;—which it dares not translate, because a just translation would expose the nature of the performance and bring it within the wholesome operation of the law ;—the avowed production of an exhausted sensualist, seeking in late romance to fan the fires which had been quenched in the arms of fourscore concubines ;—a work which no father of a family, aware of the contents, would trust on any shelf but with his Ovid and his Theocritus ;—a work of which, as it stands in the original, not a page would by the remotest possibility be allowed to be read in the House of Commons or in a court of justice ; and this not by reason of accidental differences in what nations consider as the admissible and the polite, but from the distinct absence of all design except the stirring up those animal passions, which though necessary to the maintenance of the world, have in all ages given the greatest trouble to the legislator and the moralist to keep within due bounds.

And this is to be forced upon us ;—we are to have no share in the contributions for national education, unless we will consent that my son shall sit by your daughter,—or if preferred, your son by my daughter,—and out of the canon teach her innocence all that is most hostile to feminine delicacy and domestic holiness, fitting her young soul for nothing but the inmate of one of those foul temples, where man's early ignorance was taught to worship the creator by the prostitution of his image. And all this because some Jew,—whom the present hierarchy would not have admitted to civil privileges because he *was* a Jew,—invented the monstrous blasphemy of attributing to the spirit of Him before whom angels veil their faces, impurities the dispersion of which would be a crime in the eye of human law, if once displayed to the public in their native nakedness.

But as if these causes of complaint were not enough, the church, or a prominent and distinctive part of it, has chosen the moment for proclaiming its return to the pretensions of the Papacy our fathers scattered, with the alteration only of declaring there was a mistake in the site of the tyranny. Peter was unjustly claimed by Rome ; the real Simon always was at Canterbury. We are attacked by a New Papacy ; up, then, with the flag of a New Protestantism. Drop all discussions on the authenticity of the rule by which the church professes to abide ; unless where some fragment is found in flagrant hostility to the remainder and greater quantity. But nail her to the question of her conformity to her own rule ; probe her arguments, examine her interpretations, scrutinize

the use she has made of her share of legislative power, apply the test of public and private morality to all she insists on your admitting into your families and into your schools, petition parliament and the Queen for a further purgation of the canon;—in short, being stricken, strike again. See whether your fathers exhausted the cup of reformation, or whether there may not be something left, worth pouring out on those who have provoked it.

The authenticity of a rule has always been a subtile and a dangerous question; but in all ages and countries success has attended the attempt to bring the sacerdotal power to account for its conformity to its own admitted rule. And remember that in all this, you have no quarrel with what the established church may do with her own, or what she may teach or leave untaught, to those who are voluntarily her followers. Your objection is, to her instituting an inquisitorial interference with *yourselves*;—to her demanding to be the educator of *your* children when you mistrust her morality, or else cut you off from your share in the general fund;—to her taking *your* contributions and everybody's, to be spent upon her own worship and followers exclusively, and irritating the sore by a ceaseless demand for more;—and to her doing all this in a mode and in a spirit, of which the object is manifestly to wound, and the intention to insult. It is not the possession of great power, but the abuse of it, which society is now called on to abate and to repress; and in this object it is, that whether Socialists or not, men in all quarters are found ready to unite.

London, 2 *June*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XII.

PROSECUTIONS OF PUBLISHERS.—RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL PERSECUTION.—NO HOPE FROM THE "GOOD REFORMERS."

SIR,—If the late prosecutions against publishers and venders "originated in the most commendable motives," it is difficult to admit that the same description can be applied to the after stages of the proceedings. And as the facts bear on the great master evil under which we are suffering like our forefathers, I shall take the liberty of selecting them for improvement.

A penny pamphlet, the contents of which I do not defend, is printed at Hulme near Manchester, and published by a bookseller at Manchester, Heywood. The publisher of course knows his responsibilities, and is expected to exert the usual caution. He writes to two venders of cheap publications in London, Cleave and Hetherington,—men whose trade it is to retail penny pamphlets of a thousand sorts at a time, and whom it would be as unreasonable to make responsible in the first degree for the contents of each, as it would be to make Smith, Payne and Smiths for a bad shilling passed over their counter,—and asks them to let their names appear as sellers. And what follows? The pamphlet gives umbrage; prosecutions are commenced; the publisher and primary vender at Manchester is brought up and discharged on his recognizances to appear when called for, but with an intimation that he will not be called if the past is a sufficient hint to him that the government cannot allow such publications to take place. Such at least is the newspaper account; and in all this there is nothing to blame. The government is not a voluntary agent; it is acting under the impulse of its bitter enemies behind; and the defendant, by the line he has taken, has cut off the government from the power of refusing to move.

But now comes the other half. Cleave, who only did in the way of business what a London trader must almost necessarily do for his country connexions, in confidence in every dog's being called to account for his own dirt,—is prosecuted *at the instance of the same government*, and sent to prison for four months; and Hetherington lives on, in expectation of the same lot and portion.

The question therefore arises, why the Miss Cleaves are to be fatherless, while the Miss and Master Heywoods rejoice under the paternal wing. Now I happen to know all the parties;—as "old Hornie," or somebody I took for him, once said to me at the British Museum, "If I can't tell you, there's nobody else can.*" Mr. Heywood is a rising and influential man at Manchester, and tells for a good deal at an election. It is not long since I believe he gave his support to *me;* and it might not be long before I asked him for it again, though I certainly must not be hard upon him if he replies that circumstances have made it impossible. Votes are votes, where a Whig member sits only as the representative of the falsehood, or to speak more guardedly the perjury, which allowed the deputy

* It was hoped somebody would have asked for this story. But as they have not, a capital basis for an article in Blackwood's Magazine must be lost.—*Added in* 1841.

returning-officers to refuse to record the votes for an opposing candidate. But poor Mr. Cleave votes for nobody; there is not the slightest prospect of his being the instrument of putting the ministers into a minority by a casting voice. Therefore Mr. Cleave must pay the penalty of the heretical pravity which induced him to allow his name to be added in the title-page of Mr. Heywood's bad theology. What was a venial fault, to be overlooked on a promise to take warning, in the actor in the first degree *who has votes*, is a crime to be punished with imprisonment among thieves, in the actor in the second degree *who has none*. Such is the execution of what is called criminal justice under a Whig government.

And this brings us at once to the evil. What is it we are suffering under? The same that our fathers did; Arbitrary Power. It matters not whether it is in the hands of king, bishop, or minister. It is determined by no law or decision of the community, but by the will and pleasure of some individual or class, acting upon calculation of their own particular or collective interest, whether this or that man shall enjoy the society of his family and the light of heaven, or this or that man shall be shut up with thieves instead.

And religious persecution is only one wing of the mischief; political, which is the other, is just as bad. Look at the state to which what is called the law, is brought; and see if it is anything but a law for doing without law. As Herod slaughtered the innocents by way of getting rid of one rival, so the policy which has dictated the libel law as it stands, is to make everything a libel, and then it is hard if the political Herod cannot hit his mark. Everything written by you, and me, and everybody, is in law a libel; for we are not so feeble as to write what shall not be disagreeable to somebody, and that is enough.

How this state of things is to be mended, I am under no obligation to declare. But it will not be mended by running nice divisions on the degree of personal torture to be applied in the prison-houses of our political and religious Inquisition at the discretion of the judges; and the last place from which sensible men will expect it to come, will be from those exceedingly weak and unprincipled persons who rejoice in the name of "good reformers" in the House of Commons. The judges, from causes it is not difficult to estimate, are the very parties in whose hands the determination of the degree of torsion to be given to the rack, is least to be entrusted. And the "good reformers" are men looking for their dividend out of the success of one or two rival joint-stock companies in

the practice of misgovernment; in proof of which it will be found, that no invasion of popular rights, and no sacrifice of national morality and honour, has been carried into effect without a "good reformer" being a leader of the van.

But why should the ministry court more of these impulses behind, than is inevitable? If their masters will be content with their not calling Mr. Heywood up for judgment, surely they could not be so very angry, if the same measure was extended to the others. Now why not show a little spirit, and let Mr. Cleave dine next Sunday with his family?

London, 10 *June*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XIII.

MISREPRESENTATIONS OF THE OPINIONS OF THE SOCIALISTS.—ABSURD RESTRICTIONS EXISTING UPON MARRIAGE.—"SHAKER AND RAPPITE" ARRANGEMENTS.—FALSE MOVE OF THE RELIGIOUS TYRANNY.

SIR,—Your Socialist correspondent P. S. Q. might have given me credit for being rather successful, in guessing the points upon which the opinions of the Socialists were misrepresented by their enemies.

On the subject of marriage, I seem to have gone straight down upon the fact, that the Socialists deem of marriage in general, like other reasonable men, but have not come to precisely the same conclusions with the strongest party, which means the orthodox, upon the subject of divorce. And on this has the enormous hubbub been raised. To which if the Socialists do not reply by carrying the war into the territory of their persecutors, they are weaker than they were taken for.

I have no desire to conceal the fact, that I want to assist in stirring up the Socialists to make themselves the nucleus of a resistance to the religious tyranny of the times. As was the case exactly two hundred years ago, religious imposition is the advanced guard of political; and I wish I knew the way to persuade my countrymen, to look to the rock whence they were hewn, and advance the same sturdy opposition to the progress of the evil. On this one point of marriage, see what opportunities for acting against the assailants are presented. In the first place, there is one law for the rich and another for the poor. The law and theory of divorce have often been the subjects of agitation in parliament; but it was divorce

for gentlemen,—there was always an understanding that the law, like the London Tavern, was to be open to all *who could pay*. And then in the matter of marriage itself, what restrictions calculated only to gratify the majority, in inflicting unhappiness which in the nature of things could not fall upon one man in ten! Take, for example, the prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, or husband's brother,—a marriage enforced under pains and penalties, by the laws of that barbarous nation our oppressors are ready enough to claim to be the model when the precedent is against us. But setting apart the laws of barbarians on either side, view the case as it bears upon the question of the general happiness, which is or ought to be the grand regulator after all.

In the course of nature a certain average number of the marriages contracted, must be dissolved by premature death, leaving young children deprived of a mother's care. A clever actuary would tell us in a quarter of an hour what the proportion is,—whether a twentieth, a thirtieth, or a fortieth; but whatever he states, such let it be. Under these circumstances then, as keenly afflictive perhaps as any that can be selected out of the catalogue of human woes,—there is but one woman in the world disposed by previous habits to look upon the orphans without dislike,—one woman in the whole world whom the father can take to supply the place of a mother to his children, with a moderate probability that they shall be received with kindness and not with disgust,—and this one woman, *the wiseacres that rule over us say they will bastardize his future issue if he takes.* They have no reason, no pretence, beyond their own blunders growing out of a leaning towards tyranny where they can. The Jewish law they are so fond of crushing us with, *orders* the practice; what it *forbids* is taking two sisters for wives at once. But they tell us a man ought not to look at his sister-in-law as his future wife, during the life-time of the other. No more ought he at any other woman; by the same rule therefore, all second marriages should be prohibited. The whole forms one simple piece of abuse of power for the sake of keeping the hand in; and the powers that be, were blockheads to tempt the Socialists with persecution on any connected subject. A resistance is at this moment getting up (as may be seen from advertisements in the public papers), led by men of legal and general talent; and the Socialists would do well to throw themselves into the fight.

On the question of irresponsibility, it turns out to be exactly as supposed. The Socialists, like the Mohammedans,

puzzle themselves a little with fate and free will, and the other "questions high" which Milton set apart for the Philosophical Transactions of his Pandæmonium. But like the captain of an Arab frigate I knew, I suspect that in the main they take especial care it shall be decreed that the topsails shall be reefed before a storm. I will answer for it, they teach their children the difference between robbing orchards and not robbing, and between the consequent being whipt and not being whipt. What they say is, that it is of no use to put the labouring classes into a condition where there must needs be crime, and then proceed to remedy the evil by calling for money for church extension;—that it is in vain to tell young men and maidens they must restrain their passions and keep down the list of illegitimates, if they are to sit by the side of one another, and your son is to fix the attention of my daughter, on glowing representations of the commerce of the sexes, put into their hands on the pretence of being a divine allegory. It is true enough, under such terms as these, that "all men with the same organisation, educated the same, and placed in the same circumstances, would act the same."

There remains then very little but the question of political economy. And here perhaps the best that can be said, is "Work it out." Nobody doubts that a society of old bachelors (as is the description applicable I believe to at least one, of the "Shaker and Rappite arrangements,") with wealth enough to purchase land and other appliances and means to boot, may make a snuggery to their hearts' content and be most thriving citizens; for if they cannot, who can? Nor is it more to be disputed, that a society not absolutely insisting upon celibacy, but composed of very discreet and orderly persons, by the token that all who are disposed to be indiscreet leave them, (being the principle which Mr. Cobbett said caused no Dissenters to be hanged), may in a new country, or in any country, hold their ground with any other set of traders with whom they can be compared. But this is not what our friends contend for; it is something more magnificent than this. If they said they could save cheeseparings and live on them, they might be right; but they say they have got hold of an infinite cheese. P. S. Q. I apprehend expresses this, when he says that "in the competitive system the reward of labour is precarious, in the co-operative *certain;* competition is burdened by a surplus population, co-operation *could quadruple it without inconvenience.*" Now the first essential for a quadruple population, must be to quadruple the food; which will never be done by any multiplica-

tion of waistcoats and exchanging them for shoes. We must see co-operative farmers beating Mr. Coke of Norfolk at the rate of four feet to his one; and till we see that, we must be excused for being sceptical.

But all this will right itself; and needs not interfere with the question of religious liberty, which has been brought on. The established Church has hitherto had the advantage, that there were no rank-and-file among her opponents. A few individuals sounded the bugle here and there; but the buglers had it to themselves, there were no battalions to follow. The Dissenters in general, were a race of pompous nobodies, making a rout every now and then with no object but to be conciliated like an Indian tribe with presents and concessions, and not having a whit more notion of any serious operations against their "Great Mother." In this conjuncture the Church generously comes forward to supply the want. Her ministers, as at Manchester, turn informers under obsolete or unexecuted statutes, and myriads of enthusiastic hearts and laborious arms are at once marshalled among her enemies. The Socialists preach in the highways and hedges; and the Church never withstood men that preached in the highways and hedges, and never will. It is a new state of things, and there is room for a rich campaign. The attack has been made on them, as the French say, *de gaieté de cœur;* than which nothing upon earth is more likely to lead to a serious result. But let all their action be within the law; not because the law is just, but because it is strong. People in England can be put down for being of no religion, but not for being of the wrong religion. The Socialists have had the genius to license their buildings for religious worship, and probably their preachers too; why, if they marry and are given in marriage, do not they add a license for marrying also? It would be much more decorous, than being married by a service which is so far from according with existing notions of propriety, that the clergy themselves do not repeat it entire, before people they consider as respectable;—in evidence of which, was it not boasted that in the case of the Queen, *the whole marriage service was read?* If an attempt were made to exclude them by name, it would be a curious question of permutations and combinations, through how many changes of title the game could be pursued. The Establishment must either be beaten, or impose a new test and remodel the Toleration Act; which would be putting new cloth on an old garment with a vengeance.

Once more, the religious tyranny has made the false move; and the other side are to blame, if they do not, as we should

say in the dragoons, "Chevy" them back again. Will Mr. Kidd have a bishopric, for knowing how to let well alone?

London, 17 *June*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XIV.

MINISTERIAL MORALITY BELOW ZERO.—PRACTICES ON CRIMINAL PRISONERS.—GOULD'S AND OXFORD'S CASES.—PUNISHMENT OF DEATH.

SIR,—A rather significant event took place last night in the House of Commons. The minister was left in a minority of 49, by the liberality and integrity of the House, badly constituted as it may be. In other words, the ministerial measure proposed, was in point of liberality and integrity, proved to be 49 degrees below the zero of even the present House of Commons.

The circumstances, as I understand them, were these. A few years ago, the Whig government insisted on dividing twenty millions among the West-Indian proprietors, as the condition of acceding to certain changes which the national feeling was on the point of enforcing on the subject of slavery. And they further insisted on no part of the grant being kept in reserve or made conditional; thereby evincing, as clearly as anything is evinced in the ordinary currents of this world, the *animus* of the measure. This then, passed over. And their next move was, (to borrow a simile which I have employed before, and of which it is impossible to limit the application in a state of things like ours),—their next move was, after the humanity of the nation had weakly surrendered twenty millions as the price of saving the goose from being a chimney-sweeper, to proceed with all convenient speed to employ a couple of ducks instead. They made conveyance of the twenty millions of the nation, and the West-Indian proprietors made no difficulty of accepting it, as the price of freeing one set of slaves from bondage; and then in concert with the West-Indian proprietors, they set about introducing a new set of slaves and a new slave-trade, from a different quarter. For everybody substantially knew,—both friends and enemies were quite aware,—that after all pretences were cleared away, to this and this alone, the matter came.

But as it was politic to put the ducks up the chimney by

degrees, pretence was made to limit the beginning to the Mauritius; all sorts of clues and encouragement being at the same time held out to the conclusion, that if the scheme was successful there, it would quickly be introduced in other quarters. The minister in the House of Commons moved and supported with all his powers of eloquence, the third reading of (mark the Whiggish nicety of specification) his "Colonial Passengers" Bill. Whereupon the member for the Tower Hamlets (Dr. Lushington) moved as an amendment the expunging of all the clauses inserted by the noble lord relating to the transportation of Hill Coolies to the Mauritius; which was carried by 158 against 109. Two other majorities are claimed by the anti-ministerialists on the same night; and after such a commencement, why should there not?

Thus, you see, these ministers have succeeded in placing themselves below the average morality (which is not much) of the House of Commons. Will the country Abolitionists and so forth, support them after this?

A man of the name of Gould, who had been acquitted on a trial for murder, has been tried again for being concerned in the robbery, with circumstances which call for some remark. Nothing is clearer than that an agent of the government (for every policeman is an agent, or else what is he?) was sent down to him on board the vessel in which he was on the point of emigrating to New South Wales, to hold out to him the lure of 200*l.* in return for giving information which might lead to the conviction of other parties; and when the simpleton gave into the snare, he was immediately seized, and the information turned against himself. Now this is abominably disgraceful to those who pretend to execute the law. Criminal justice ought not to be held up as a common liar, even though the lie be practised against a thief. The only consequence will be, that all future thieves will be on their guard against the falsehood, and so the public deprived of the benefit of their informations against each other. And this from the law too, which on other occasions affects to be almost afraid to let the winds of heaven blow upon a criminal, lest they should abstract from him something like an intimation of his guilt.

But there is more than this. The judge, in the execution of the office it is growing the fashion to put upon him, is curious in determining the degree of torment which shall be assigned to the entrapped thief in the government's Tartarus. It was vastly better and more decent, when the Secretary of State was made to play the devil on these occasions. He was much less

of a marked man; his interference was supposed to take place after time had been given for virtuous indignation to cool, and not under the impression of that storm of feeling, which moves an aged gentleman from his propriety, and makes him dissolve into childish tears, at doing what he has perhaps done fifty times before, and means to do fifty times again; and as a consequence, it bore the appearance of something like a re-hearing of the case, which was consolatory to all concerned. And all these reasons have a tenfold force now, when the conduct of criminal justice is but a palæstra or course of exercise, to be turned on occasion against perhaps the most deserving members of the community; when in fact the known and avowed object of this screwing-up of the powers of judges, is to be able to act with a vigour unknown to the Tory times, against such as shall bring themselves within the application of an obscure and undefined law, in the hands of the government of the day.

The sentence of the judge on Gould may give rise to some useful reflections. According to the *Times*, "that sentence was transportation for life, and he was authorised to add to it a still heavier punishment, which was, that he be sent to a penal colony there to pass the remainder of his existence in hopeless slavery, poverty, and misery of the worst description. The learned judge then passed sentence of transportation in the usual form."

Now I very much doubt the propriety in a free country, of allowing any man to condemn any other man to "hopeless slavery, poverty, and misery of the worst description." It is not that crime must not be punished; but I object to the manner, on the ground of policy, of decency, and the desirableness of making the law respectable. Here is a man who has been driven to crime, in great part, by those laws and ordinances of the aristocracy which prohibit honest industry from receiving the bread it toils for. It might be the fact, that he as an individual never knew what hurt him; but he was part of the great mass, who are putrefying in the lump under the influence of the landlords' prohibition. He escapes once from the consequences of his guilt, and so narrowly, as without demanding righteous compunction from a man cut off as he had been from encouragement to moral habits, might at least impress upon him the hazards of the course. He gives as strong an evidence of returning virtue as his case and the time for it would admit, by determining voluntarily to expatriate himself; and he is on board ship for that purpose, and heaven only knows what sparks of good resolution might

have stirred among the ashes of his depraved and corrupted mind, when lo! appears the tempter himself, in the shape of a uniformed agent of the law, and jingles in his ear once more the old temptation, two hundred sovereigns rich and round; holding out the promise of a little eternity of all the artificially brutalized commonalty of this land are in the habit of thinking most irresistible. The snare succeeds; the devil black or blue is listened to; a new crime is contemplated under the direct procuration of the familiar of the government, which might have ended in the condemnation of the innocent;—and the law, like the juggling fiend of which it condescends to make itself the image, enjoys an unearthly laugh at the simplicity of the gulled sinner. Recollect that it was for no after crime, and no defect of opportunity to try him for what was past, that all this was executed. The sages of the law had the criminal in their full power, and determined that it was not meet to proceed against him for the minor offence. They preferred throwing him off the hook, as an angler sated with sport might loose a captive fish, with the humane object of trying whether he could after being pricked once be caught again. Is this morality, is this decency; is the law so strong that it cannot be made disreputable, though its mal-practices are only on a thief? But everybody knows, that they are not reserved for thieves. They are treasured up for use against such of us, as like the oppressed Canadians, may be less fortunate than the French people in resisting the treasonable destruction of the constitution by an armed force. It is time to oppose this system of legal torment got up before our eyes; especially when we know, that the main feature of it, the ultimatum to be applied perhaps to some defeated Washington or captured Lafayette, is exposure to a death, to which that of the Benjamite's concubine is the nearest parallel which decency allows to suggest. The aristocracy cannot be indulged, in first creating crime by their enactments, and then varying the monotony of preserving game and determining the minimum which can support a pauper and escape the verdict of a coroner, by running divisions on the different gradations of natural and unnatural suffering, and titillating well-born nerves with the idea of an auto-da-fé *à la Norfolk Island.*

The times are fertile in crime; as who can wonder, when the plough and harrow have been so long guided as they have. Even a foreign valet can discover, that the market for honest labour in England "*is fell,*" and therefore cutting throats

"*is riz.*" There seems to be an odd dispute just now, as to what is the duty of a counsel, whose client has confessed his guilt to him the night before. Clearly, I should say, to make a lucid statement of all defects in the evidence, and all the contingencies by which the appearances against his client might fail to be conclusive; such a speech, in short, as might be made to-morrow, on the supposition that the criminal had been proved to be delirious when he confessed. It is useful to try to settle this, because there are prejudices not grounded in reason, against the profession of an advocate; all based upon overlooking the leading fact, that the best way of administering criminal justice, is to hang nobody till his guilt is proved, and that the best mode of securing this, is to allow everybody to make the best defence he can, either by his own mouth or that of the advocate he chuses to prefer.

Opinions seem to lean towards the belief, that it will turn out that Oxford fired no balls; and that he intended only a stupid hoax, for which he should be birched till the hind quarters of the little elephant at the Zoological Gardens are but a type of him, but which does not amount to treason. Suppose it should turn out, that he fired a gooseberry; what blasphemy it would have been held, if anybody in the House of Commons had suggested that it was as well to wait for some human decision on this question, before men ran the chance of making gooseberry-fools of themselves before high heaven, by rushing into its awful presence on such a simple errand! But thus it is, that feeble adulation tends to overset itself. What right had the Church to set the whole public for thirty days crying out against an assassin, before it had been decided that there had been any assassination attempted? Of two things there is likely to be one;—either a prejudiced jury of expectant loyalists will find a verdict against the prisoner on the authority of the Church that there has been an assassination and a miracle, or if public opinion in the interval takes an opposite turn, he will be let off through the tough scruples of some indignant juryman, and perhaps escape with more facility than he deserves. It is not at all improbable that somebody will accuse me, as was Titus Oates's phrase, of wanting to "*stoifle the plat;*" but on reflection I think I shall have you to a great extent upon my side. The whole evidence of intent to kill, is as yet very weak. Where ragged boys were set to look for balls, the only wonder is that like St. Januarius's teeth they did not fill a bushel; and if you are at any time driven by the wall of St. Paul's Church Yard, you will see a dozen marks which any

zealous policeman would pronounce to be a bullet's. I suppose everybody, except the high church, will be glad if it turns out no plot; and our chances as yet seem very good.

But, as in other cases, the "effect defective came by cause." The powers that be, were the organizers of the attempt. There must be a licenser of plays, to prevent the wholesome progress of opinion from appearing on the stage; and while he excludes the salutary food, he caters for the relaxation of the working community the unmanly ribaldry of "Jack Sheppard." The rising generation of pot-boys are taught through her Majesty's officer to seek the bubble reputation at the gallows' foot; and then the public is astonished that a noodle squibs off at the Queen.

A bill has been brought in for the abolition of capital punishment, except in cases of "murder and *treason;*" and these are retained, the mover says, "in deference to the house." The last, it is to be hoped, is retained only in deference to the present ministry, who think their chance of gaining by a sanguinary law, greater than their chance of suffering by it. The law of treason, is in fact a law for allowing the successful party in a civil war to massacre its prisoners. The French, in the name of the people all over the world, gallantly refused to take advantage of it against their beaten adversaries in the glorious contest of July 1830. All that can be hoped is, that since the opposite party is incapable of the like magnanimity, their law will be executed on them the next time it comes to be their turn.

The people would also do well to demand (if they can demand anything) that the crime of violence to women should be among the last from which the punishment of death is taken away. One principal test which places an act in the first class of crime, is that it is irremediable: and in this quality the crime in question, is prominent in a degree only to be equalled by the crime of murder. But I speak advisedly in saying, that among the aristocracy who rule over us, there is a great apathy to dangers of this kind affecting the "lower orders." Who, indeed, can feel much for coarse girls who carry about pots of beer to rude and sometimes half-intoxicated men,—girls to be found by themselves in narrow lanes, doing some vulgar master's bidding, at hours when aristocracy would hardly think herself safe within the walls of a carriage? There is not a daughter of a man of three hundred pounds a-year (which is the lowest qualification for the House of Commons), violated in a century; why then should the law be strict, where the lawgiver has so little risk to run?

The argument from all which is, that exactly as the lawgivers do not care, the people should.

A curious circumstance happened on the night when the member for the Tower Hamlets so gallantly blew up the "Hill Cooly" fraud. The Tories moved a clause in a bill, for the exclusion of the Judge of the Court of Admiralty (to wit, the present member for the Tower Hamlets) from the House of Commons after the present session; and the minister immediately conceded the point. Of such stuff is government made. Dr. Lushington has been forty years in parliament, and may soon find the business of his court as much as he can get through. But let us hope he shall "never want a man to stand before the Lord" in the House of Commons for ever, in commemoration of the gallant deed which signalized his latter day.

London, 24 *June*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XV.

SUBJECT FOR CONGRATULATION BY M. THIERS.—PLUNDERING POLICY OF CIVILIZED NATIONS.—WRONG LOCATION OF POWER, THE CAUSE.

SIR,—A curious speculation has been lately given as proceeding from the French minister M. Thiers, which has interest in these times when the communication of feeling among nations as distinguished from their rulers for the time being, is so much on the increase.

Not having the document before me, I cannot answer for accuracy of detail. But the leading idea was this. The French minister undertook to congratulate himself and Europe in general, upon the extent to which the great powers were severally engaged in plundering less civilized or less powerful states, with the happy effect of preventing hostilities among themselves. And the special instances given, were the operations of Russia against the Circassians, of France against the Arabs of the North of Africa, and of England against the Chinese;—a flattering association, for which I hope we all feel a due weight of obligation.

Now what an invitation does this hold out, not for hypocritical reflections on the weakness of human nature and the necessity of patience under earthly ills, but for the much more

profitable contemplation, of the extent to which the management of public affairs in all the countries with which we are connected, is seized by those whose interests are not the same with the interests of the inhabitants, and the various crafts and delusions by which influential masses are induced to join, and the remainder to submit.

The case of Russia, you will say, is an instance of admitted despots tyrannizing over avowed slaves; driving them to slaughter, with an understanding that they are to think themselves too happy, if the sacrifice of a thousand of their little lives, can gain a star for the button-hole of one colonel-proprietor. And so it is; but it is worth examining, how large a portion of the absurdity which the Russian people cannot protect themselves against, others submit to who might. And this will lead to the discovery, that the machinery in both cases is to a great extent the same; ignorance, false estimates of good, a strong propensity to die for clap-trap, habits of looking for gain to pillage, and taking no note of the times when the pillage, by the natural revolution of the wheel, must fall upon themselves.

A former generation of Russian peasants (for military generations are short) had been driven by their lords and masters against "their hereditary enemies" the Turks; and after manuring the provinces which contained the Turkish fortresses with their carcases, the remnant succeeded in carrying back the news to their hovels, that the Turkish government had been obliged to cede Circassia. But here arose a new dilemma. The Circassians refused to be given up; or at all events, to let the Russians take. The difficulty was the same, as if through the operations of a Russian fleet and army, the "Court of St. James's" had signed a parchment giving up Scotland to the "Court of St. Petersburg," and the Scotch had refused to be transferred. And hereupon ensues a glorious opportunity, for sending young aristocrats to win stars and orders from the Circassians if they can. But what is a common Russian to bring back? Not salt to his black bread; if he is lucky enough to bring back himself. Nevertheless he is to be cockered up, with notions that he has been fighting for a great Papa or a great Mamma; and is expected diligently to rear slaves for future consumption, on penalty of being "a bad Russian" if he neglects the duty.

But this, you will say, is avowedly the history of a barbarous people. See then, how much better France is, that is *not* barbarous. Near fifty years ago, the Dey of Algiers supplied the French people with corn, when the despots of Europe were

engaged in starving them in punishment for attempting political reform; and the Dey remained unpaid. In five and twenty years from that, the French Pretender was brought back to Paris by foreign arms: and there was nothing wonderful in the fact, that he was in no hurry to pay the French people's debt, contracted to keep him out. The Dey however, or his successor, began to think the time long, and pressed for payment. Whereupon the French royalist agent at Algiers was instructed to be personally insolent to the Dey in public, and was insolent accordingly; which the Dey, departing much from the habits attributed in common parlance to a Dey of Algiers, returned only by motioning his insolent debtor to a side, with a fan of feathers he was holding in his hand. This movement the royalist agent had his cue to declare "a blow;" and thereon the restored Bourbons proceeded to execute a plan they had prepared, first for preventing payment of the just debt of the French nation contracted in opposing their return, and secondly for reviving the barbarous political and religious feelings of the dark ages, by engaging in something like the repetition of a Crusade. The French military too, or the dangerous portion of them, were to be killed off; and new armies raised, to be—

> "——The Pope's well-managed pack,
> And when he laid them on the scent of blood,
> To hunt a Saracen through fire and flood."

Algiers was taken; the traitor of Waterloo rewarded with the command; and some corporals made sergeants. But soon there supervened the Revolution of the Three Days. All men then naturally supposed, that the royalist expedition against free France would have been at an end. Nobody surmised that a plan begun, carried forward, and upheld with the direct purpose of retaining France in subjection to her enemies, could have been maintained after the power that commenced it was destroyed. But see what the most intelligent and civilized of nations can be made to do, under the influence of the wretched clap-traps to which men are yet born slaves. There was blood, there was burning, there were towns to be taken and destroyed, heads to be cut off and ears of enemies to be brought in;—how could a Frenchman be expected to resist the invitation? Yet these same Frenchmen saw nothing in it so facetious, when processes approaching to the same were a few years before in the course of application to themselves. Why has not an Arab a right to defend his crops from being destroyed in the plains of the Metidja, as well as a Frenchman in

the neighbourhood of Lyons or Dijon? But thus it is, that mankind in all countries are made fools of by those who undertake to be their masters. What compensation is it to a French peasant whose son has been carried off to perish in the hospitals or no hospitals of Algiers, that the princes of the house of Orleans returned in perfect health from a warm ride and a bottle of claret when they asked for it? But so it is. The French peasant has been drilled and instructed to believe, that the first duty of a French peasant is to kill or be killed when anybody (for himself is nobody) shall tell him it is their desire; and he would think himself a dishonoured man if he should stop to inquire, whether he, or anybody else except a few individuals who are to see their names in paragraphs, gets value in return.

And all this does not involve the smallest opposition to the truth, that there *are* occasions when it is for the honour and interest of nations to exert themselves and sacrifice private feelings to the general good. The complaint is, that the civilized nations grasp infamy for honour. Does any sane and honest man, for example, doubt, that at the existing moment, the Circassian, Arab, or Chinese, who is defending what the Europeans when their turn comes call their "hearths and altars," with whatever defect of means and inferiority of skill, is yet the real hero, and the Russian, French, or Englishman who is assailing him, the scoundrel? There is no honour in serving felons; this is the great verity, which be the risk what it may, it is our business to impress upon the world. Fight, as John Wesley's soldiers said in Flanders, "knee-deep in blood," when it is for justice, for liberty, for sound and real honour and renown. But do not fight for the chance of having it said, "There goes a man who had his leg knocked off in serving villains." Think of a man displaying a timber toe and saying, "Some smugglers here wanted to cram opium down the throats of another nation; and this is my share of what came of it."

Whatever may be the sin or shame of other nations, it is clear that our own is behind none, especially if our opportunities of knowing better be taken into the account. And this is the subject of congratulation discovered for us all by M. Thiers. As long as we are employed making beasts of ourselves elsewhere, we refrain from exercising our teeth and claws on one another. But does not all this point to something rootedly wrong in the seat or location of power among the European nations? When the people have for a season got power into their hands, it has never displayed itself in a desire for in-

fringing the rights of others. It did not on the occasion of the French revolution; on the contrary the French people had their agent conciliating and imploring to the last, when he was driven out by the eagerness of our aristocrats for war. It did not on the occasion of the Three Days of July; on the contrary the result was a grand league and coalition between the veritable constituencies of two nations, the effects of which are probably yet to prove. It is absurd to set up in opposition to this, that there were military republics in antiquity; the grand or only great example intended, being in fact nothing but one of the bloodiest and most grinding aristocracies that has appeared on earth, the proof of which is, that it is continually referred to at this day for lessons by our own.

To return to matters of more confined extent, you will find on examination that I never supported the exclusion of any particular crime from the impending abolition of death punishment, but only exhorted the people not to allow the experiment to be begun upon their women as *in corpore vili*. When the rest go, in heaven's name let that; but do not let it head the list. But a remark I omitted before, and should be glad to make now, is that a practical prevention of crime, and at the same time amounting almost to an abolition of the capital punishment, would be effected, in this and other cases which it is needless to detail, by punishing the *assault with intent* &c., with transportation for life, or whatever else may be the greatest punishment short of death. The subject is not a pleasant one to dilate on; but I think men accustomed to calculate the relations between temptation and offence, would see in such a provision a substantial diminution of the crop of actual crime, which is the great object in pursuit.

London, 1 *July*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XVI.

Celebration of the Liberation of William Lovett.

Sir.—As what may perhaps answer the purpose of our weekly exercise, a copy is inclosed to you of the reply to a letter with which I have been honoured from the committee for celebrating the release of Mr. Lovett. As Bedford gaol is

a sort of classic ground, for being the " den" where the gifted Bunyan dreamed his dreams, so I hope something like similar recollections will be attached to Warwick, in the memory of our posterity.

I rejoice to see the Marshalls, who were friends of my father's, putting themselves at the head of a popular movement. I would that more of the merchant-princes of England took the same course.

Few of your readers will feel any difficulty from a misprint in the letter of 1st July, in a name which should manifestly have been John Wesley's. His were the last of the race of military martyrs in Europe;—valiant soldiers of " the train," who when both their legs were stricken off by a cannon-shot, asked to be laid upon a gun to die, that with their last breath they might exhort their comrades to " fight knee-deep in blood, for God and the House of Hanover." A little more torturing in prisons, and we may see the like spirit again.

Here follows the copy, mentioned in the first paragraph.—

To Mr. R. Moore, 20, Hyde-Street, Bloomsbury, Secretary to the committee for the arrangement of a public dinner at White Conduit House, on Monday, August 3, to congratulate Mr. William Lovett on his release from Warwick gaol.

Sir,—I am deeply sensible of the honour done to me in your letter of yesterday's date, by the desire expressed that I should preside at the dinner to congratulate our friend Lovett on his release from Warwick gaol. But if I try to show cause why the committee should re-consider their determination, I feel assured that no unfavourable construction will be put on my attempt.

It strikes me forcibly, that the committee should secure a Member of Parliament to discharge the office.

First, because by the habits of the country, a political demonstration which has not a Member of Parliament at its head, is set down as weak, and consequently of diminished importance to friends and foes.

Secondly, because in consequence of the same settled habits of opinion, a Member of Parliament may do safely and therefore effectually, what another cannot. In a contest like the present, against political parties possessing an overwhelming superiority of power, it seems to me there are only two positions, from which any opposition can be conducted by an individual, with a prospect of balancing the difference of

strength. And these are, the position of a Member of Parliament appearing at the head of those who are actually or virtually his constituents, and that of an individual presenting himself as a candidate at an election. For these, and perhaps these only, the enemy has a very extensive reverence, founded on the knowledge of the mass of feeling he would bring upon his head if he treated them with contempt. In one of these two positions therefore, I apprehend your leaders must act, if you are to have any leaders who are not to be sent to Warwick gaol or York Castle, or peradventure to be the patients in an auto-da-fè *à la Norfolk Island*, the moment their leading shall make them worth the trouble. I say this with much of the feelings of an old hussar; by which I do not mean a man who has been used to wear a particular kind of cap, but one who has been accustomed to take his life in his hand, as a subaltern of light troops does seven days a-week, and trust for success to that mixture of boldness and caution, which is the only thing to bring you out of the wood, when inconsiderable forces are to act with the chances of exposure to strong.

When I possessed the fair advantages which other men now have, nobody could charge me with being slow to show my face in an advance. But I was put down and trodden out of parliament, by what is known by the name of the Lichfield House compact, of which the member for all Ireland was the head, and the members for Kilkenny and Wigan were the tail, on no other ground but being thought a man not likely to chime in; and I have lost no opportunity of justifying the correctness of the prognostication. The people have no where had the energy, or perhaps the power, which might have made this policy recoil on the toes of the authors; and no man can make bricks, unless somebody will find him straw. Nor was there any defect of the other appliances. In a country where the legislative power is by various legislative contrivances made a thing for purchase, I was always ready to buy a portion for the people's use. But nobody would help; and a great many would hinder. The Whig press posted me by name as a man who was never to be allowed to re-enter parliament; and the master-manufacturers,—in whose cause I had poured out the patrimony of my children like water, at a time when by themselves they could not tell what hurt them,—subscribed for the same worthy purpose, in revenge for my having taken the side of the working classes and the unrepresented. The people have acted weakly; perhaps it was because they were weak. They have allowed an old friend to be trampled on, by the "good reformers" who have succeeded in stopping all

reform. It may be that their wakefulness will return with their strength.

But the essential thing is, what we are to do now. One point is in our favour; that we are incapable of despair. Like the saints, we know that we shall inherit the earth; and consequently all things which happen, are only so many turns the road must take to lead to that conclusion. In your meeting of the third of August, do not evaporate in words. Omit all execration of the government; you can do that by yourselves at home at any time. Try to do something substantial that shall last. Lay the foundation of a society for carrying candidates of your opinions to the poll all over the empire at the next general election, which may be to-morrow. On this point the fear of you has been confessed; ministers, you are told by the Irish leader, cannot dissolve parliament because the "real Reformers are suffocated by Tory-Radicals and Chartists,"—terms of abuse given to all who have not helped to "burke" reform. Look sharply after the old Tory-made laws; which will be applied to you and to nobody else. And for this purpose, get Francis Place to be of your counsels; he knows more of the matter than the Lord Chancellor. Have no secretaries, either in town or country; any two active citizens may correspond, and defy the devil and all his works. When the society is in activity, put me down for a thousand pounds, as I offered long ago. Never mind whether your candidates are returned or not; your business is to carry them to the poll and get the most votes you can. In places which send one member to parliament, see to getting up a candidate of your own, and try your strength if it is only twenty. Where there are to be two members, offer to join with either of the parties of Whigs and Tories to bring in one and one, if you can trust them. But if you cannot, set up two candidates of your own, for there will be little use in one; and perhaps the best way of all, is to set up your two candidates first, and then negotiate for keeping one back if somebody will join. But have your second candidate ready to reproduce the moment treachery is practised against you. Remember that you are playing with edge tools, and that nobody exercises the vulgar virtue of veracity, to a popular party or a popular candidate. Useful hints as to the constituencies where circumstances are favourable, were contained in a list of 350 places, published in the *Weekly True Sun* of 26th May 1839, and reprinted in the *Leeds Times* of 23rd May 1840. The expense of the hustings is not very great; and it would be the business of the proposed society to assist, where a constituency was clearly unable to do

without. Never play the foolish trick of nominating a candidate and withdrawing him before the conclusion of the poll. Watch the deputy returning-officers, to see if they perjure themselves by refusing to record votes for your candidates, as was done to me at Manchester; and if they try it, we will have some of them in the pillory, or whatever may be the modern succedaneum. Your candidates, if not on the spot, cannot be prevented from being carried to the poll by the demand of their qualifications; at all events unless there is one law for me at Manchester and another for you elsewhere. But I know that an election is nothing but a trial of strength, the rogues against the honest men, and that there is neither law nor justice for a people's candidate; therefore it may be as well to have what a sailor calls "a preventer" at hand. Let your society publish the names of such qualified persons as will allow themselves to be proposed wherever a candidate is wanted to try your strength with. In the last resort, there will always be myself and my eldest son. My qualification is, £600 a-year clear of deductions, in life estate in the parishes or townships of Cottingham, Patrington, and Hollym, in the East Riding of the County of York; and my eldest son is qualified in consequence too. His christian names are Thomas Perronet Edward, and his legal description is Esquire and Barrister-at-law, of 21, Old Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, in the County of Middlesex. Above all things, in all times and places, look keenly after every man who ever called himself "a good reformer," or uttered the word "Tory-Radical;" depend on it, he was one that helped to sell your pig.

One thing more. If there is good in you at all, send our friend Lovett to parliament at the next general election. He is in all personal respects the most fit and proper man for you in England; and if it is a qualification that is wanted, we will talk about that another time. No earthly thing would so flurry our opponents; and they will laugh in their sleeves at the working classes, as long as they cannot send a man of themselves to the House of Commons. The necessary expenses might easily be defrayed. If he is to go to the Speaker's dinners, we shall have to buy him a monkey-dress; unless the representatives of the people have by that time liberated themselves from the degradation of going to their own servant in the livery of court footmen. William Lovett in a sword and bag, would be enough to put down the practice by himself. It would seriously go a long way towards the discovery, that there had been a mistake in calculating what the people's representatives were made of. And what a chuckle, to see him standing

opposite the minister in the House of Commons, looking "threepence a-day for bacon, eggs, milk, and butter." You positively must do it, if it is only for the jest's sake. There is not a working man in England, who would not rather give his shilling for it, than go into the shilling gallery.

You must bestir yourselves; and as a reason the more, remember you are coming upon the centenaries of the glorious struggle maintained by our ancestors against arbitrary power, which began as things are doing now, with personal cruelties, and church encroachments. The enemies of the present settlement, who oddly enough are the Hanoverians this time, have their celebrations on the subject; and we must have ours. Meanwhile, regale your valued guest to his heart's content; only take care the change from the ministerial diet is not too rapid. Take down all the items of his past treatment. We do not mean to deny, that for the peccadilloes of his pen, a fine of ten pounds, or a fortnight's imprisonment on the debtor's side with liberty to keep himself, might have been a justifiable intimation that he must not expect to run his head against stone walls for nothing. But for all the balance, we intend to make reprisals on a lord.

Finally, take for your example the proceedings which led to Catholic Emancipation in Ireland. "Whatever man has done, that man can do." They started there from much smaller beginnings; and they have lived to threaten you with three hundred thousand men. Why should not we be able to return the compliment?

I am, Sir, Your very obedient servant,
T. PERRONET THOMPSON.

London, 5 *July*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XVII.

THE "OXFORD" PLOT.—VERDICT OF THE JURY.—NECESSITY FOR WATCHING THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAW.—CHILDREN MAY BE VIOLATED, WHO CANNOT SAY THEIR CATECHISM.—THE MANCHESTER PROSECUTION.—CHURCH TYRANNY AND GREED.

SIR,—We were right in our surmise. A jury has declared there is no proof there was any plot at all. The church's thanksgivings have been for that very ordinary miracle, the escape from a pistol in which it is not proved there was any ball; and gooseberry knights have received their knighthoods, in the absence of proof that any more dangerous projectile was

concerned. These are follies of our enemies which we have a full right to comment on;—defining, if it be necessary, our enemies to be a time-serving church and title-loving middle class, who had not sense or decency to wait till it was established to the satisfaction of a human tribunal, that the offence implied had been committed.

As the administration of justice, like water, is a necessary of life in every community and it is desirable it should be pure, there is matter for regret whenever the results of examination are not favourable to keeping up the prestige of its being something removed, so far as human institutions can be, from the intrusion of human failings. The thoughtful public,—by which is meant the public who have reflection enough to know, that law is not to be administered by the feelings of momentary indignation against uncertain guilt, but by rules calculated to give the greatest certainty to the aggregate of its decisions,—will see many moments, at which the conduct of the authorities was not what any man would wish to see applied to his own case. For example, when the counsel for the prisoner asked whether the government had found any traces of the existence of the pretended society, why was the question quashed and public justice defrauded of the benefit of the answer? Everybody knew that the government had found no society at all, and that therefore the question asked really was, "Has not the government ascertained, that all this pretended society, with its caps, and bows, and orders, existed only in the imagination of the prisoner?" There was distinct evidence, that the letters of the Secretary, were the Secretary writing to himself. I remember in early youth, the openings of a roaming disposition were detected in me, by the discovery in my drawer of the commencement of an imaginary journal to the Greenland seas. If it had been necessary to ask the government, "Have you discovered anything to make you believe this youngster ever actually went to Greenland," there would have been just as much reason in quashing the interrogation.

And then when the verdict is brought in,—what quantities of what Sir Roger L'Estrange rudely denominates "hugger-mugger," were put in requisition for the occasion. The jury had been categorically told, that they were to determine on three points; firstly, whether he fired the pistols; secondly, whether the pistols were loaded with ball; and thirdly, whether he was of sane mind. And like well-meaning poor officers accordingly, and having the reverence of the authority that told them so before their eyes, they answered with equal precision; firstly, that he fired the pistols; secondly, that it

was not proved the pistols were loaded with ball; and thirdly, that he was as mad as a fool could be. The verdict appears to have been microscopically regular and according to the directions of the expounder of the law. Why, then, was a slur to be thrown on the jury, by the suggestion that they perhaps had not considered a point, which they were declaring with all their might they had? The real declaration to the jury was, "Gentlemen, it will not do for you to acquit this man because it is not proved there were any balls. You must huddle up your verdict against your consciences already expressed, and give us a darkling verdict in new words, which shall enable us to confine this man for life." There is not a single juryman who will aver, that when he brought in the second verdict "Guilty, and not of sane mind," he meant to say that his darkness had been enlightened on the subject of whether there were balls in the pistols or not, or that anything had occurred on after consideration to make him view the transaction in a light differing from the first. He succumbed to power, to the fear of being called disloyal, and the desire to save trouble. It is intimated, in some far from un-influential journals, that the matter must be the subject of future revision. And it is of more consequence, because the jury were distinctly urged from a powerful quarter, to act "for the guidance of future juries;" in other words, to consider themselves as laying down a precedent.

But perhaps it will be urged, that there is no harm done, but only an insane blockhead shut up as is best for him. There *is* enormous harm *in wresting the law*, whether a fool or a wise man is in the case; and for this plain reason, that the wresting which is applied to the fool the first time, may be applied to the wise man the second. It may not be precisely the same wresting; but, once destroy the rectilinearity of the law, and the angels in heaven do not know into what bends and curvets of obliquity it may divaricate before it has done.

As the law is the subject, new instances rise up every day, of the degree in which it is wrested to the crooked purposes of individuals. The important inference from all of which is, if it be possible, to do something towards getting rid of the infatuation which teaches men to consider themselves as living in a sort of celestial condition that wants no mending,—the very frame of mind, in short, which the scripture ascribes to those who say "Behold we are rich, and filled with goods," and "know not that they are poor, and blind, and naked." In fact this beautiful opinion of our own estate, handed down from father to son, is the great mark of barbarism burnt in,

and the strongest instrument by which the intelligent oppressors keep their hold on the non-intelligent oppressed.

View then a case which you will find in the journals of the past week, and suppose for argument's sake that you or yours stood in the shoes of the injured. A female child of some ten years is brutally violated. The man who did it, as frequently happens, did not summon the neighbourhood to witness his abduction of the child; but there was no doubt whatever of his having carried the child to a place suited for the purpose. The medical evidence of the commission of the crime, is complete and horrible. The man is brought before a magistrate by the justly excited mother and neighbourhood. His trial for the crime seems certain. But there was one chance the neighbourhood had not calculated on. There are three or four kinds of accessaries after the fact. One is, where the inducement has been a previous connexion and interest in the prisoner and his plan, though it is only the after assistance that can be proved; another may be, where the assistance has arisen out of mere compassion for an individual in distress and danger; a third, where it proceeded from the hope of pecuniary gain; and a fourth, which is different from them all, is where the gain was not positively pecuniary, but consisted in the opportunity of furthering some object of private affection or interest at the expense of the public. Of this last class of accessaries was the magistrate in question. He happened to be what, with no intent or risk of injuring real goodness, is technically termed "a saint." He saw the opportunity of advancing the glory of his own opinions, or in other words the power of his sect, at the expense of the violated child. So he said to the mother, "Woman, how much knoweth this child of the Church's catechism?" The furious mother confessed, not much. He then proceeded to examine the sufferer herself. The child declared she had a grandfather, who had made some communications to her touching the nature of the devil. "Woman," replied the dispenser of British justice in the 19th century, whom a Turkish populace would have hooted from his seat if he had dispensed such justice to the meanest Rayah,—"you have educated your child very ill. Such children may be violated with impunity. I shall not allow her evidence to be heard." And so the brutal violator of children walked out of court, wondering as he went (for so the report intimates) whether it was some joke that was played upon him in informing him he was at large.

Now here we see the point brought fairly to issue, between us and the oppressive sect which calls itself the established

church. Our daughters' freedom from violation, is held by the condition that they know the Church's catechism. If they are deficient in answering that their name is "*N.* or *M.*," or to any other extent a bigoted magistrate may chuse *ex post facto* to assign, they are free marks for any son of Belial that may covet them. Society does not exist for us, further than as we are of the established church; of which the necessary consequence is, that those who are not of it, if they will have law, must take their rifles when they are able, and be a law unto themselves. We are not of society because we are men, but because we are followers of the priest. Our daughters are not protected by virtue of any compact among fathers for mutual defence; they are safe only in their character of curtsiers in aisles and mute gazers on the splendour of the vicar. A regiment of soldiers might turn out, and enact the "five pleas of the law" upon the whole juvenile population of a district, on the condition only of selecting those who could not get through their "Duty to their Neighbour" without halting.

And observe, that the thing enforced upon us, is not that if a jury of twelve men find a witness so absolutely unpossessed of all idea of obligation to speak the truth, and the circumstances so unfavourable for sifting the evidence of the witness and judging of its correctness, that they cannot conscientiously condemn a prisoner on the sole word of such an individual, they shall be at liberty to say so, and acquit him accordingly. But the privilege is claimed for every individual magistrate, fasting or after dinner, wise man or fool, that he may set up a standard where and how he likes, and proclaim our daughters ravishable by law where they do not come up to His Worship's mark. And in the present case the opportunities were infinite, from the mere ignorance of the sufferer (though the subject is not a pleasant one to dilate on), for any sane and honest jury or individual to detect the slightest approach to instilled or premeditated falsehood on the part of the principal witness. But from all this, a jury and the public are to be cut off; it is to remain a sealed truth in the bosom of His Worship, that the girl was in a state of religious feeling fit only to be ravished. The complaint is not of the power of juries to decide, but of the power of any individual magistrate to stop a capital case from coming to a hearing, under the temptation of being pointed out among his fellow sectarians as "good Alderman so-and-so, who helped to ravish the naughty little girl that could not say her catechism."

Very much of the same kind is the case which has just occurred at Manchester. A respectable man offers himself to take an oath demanded by the law for procuring a license for

a lecture-room. He is directly pulled up with the inquiry, whether he is of the true faith. The question turns on whether he believes in a state of future retribution. He says he believes in a state of reward; and with this demi-faith the simple man thinks to enter within the rights of British citizenship. But the theological Cerberus has more to ask him than that, before he may pass the gate. It is all very well that you believe in our Elysium; but do you equally believe in our Alecto, Tisiphone, and Megæra, and in the three-formed goddess who is here and in earth and heaven? And there the poor soul was weighed and found wanting; he would not come up to the required degree of hell's thermometer, nor swear to the orthodox length of the devil's tail. And to such miseries as this, are come the boasted liberties of Englishmen. It all returns to what was set out with. We think we are something, and affect to grin at Spaniards and Portuguese; and all the while we are the most priest-ridden nation on earth, and suffer things from the insolent priesthood of a segment of the people, which would blow at the moon the Catholic church in Spain and Portugal if it dreamed of exercising them. It was but the other day, I found the great artery of communication in London closed, by the stopping of Temple Bar by a policeman, who stood in the midst and turned back all public carriages attempting to go through. And on asking the reason, it was stated to be, because it was a holyday of the church. Some "good reformer" had stuck this into a New Police Act; and I suppose took out his reward, in the praise of being a good church-going gentleman for a Reformer. The people gazed sulkily on; two or three dirty lads looked very much as if they should like to begin an *émeute*, as would certainly have been the consequence of a similar piece of insolence on the part of the church in Paris, Madrid, or Lisbon. But those places, forsooth, are under Romish darkness.

Do you know how much it was intended to move for, if the late motion for church extension had had luck? The lowest account gives six millions, and the more ample one says eight. We positively live and move and breed for the priest and the slave-master. To get £30,000 for education, could not be done. For the Queen's horses, £70,000 was an easy matter. For the priesthood, six millions in contemplation. For the slave-holders, whose every property we have bought out of our own pockets, and are buying still, twenty millions, gone as surely as the last egg that was sucked by polecats. Can these things go on? I verily believe they can.

London, 14 *July*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XVIII.

CANADA BILL.—GENERAL RECIPE FOR OPPPRESSION.—A "PETTIFOGGING PARLIAMENTARY REBELLION."

SIR,—The Canada Bill which has just issued from the mint of legislation, and reached the point of becoming law, is so curious a specimen of "the intent of tyranny avow'd," that if our unrepresented classes had eyes to see and ears to hear, they would lay it to their hearts as a providential lesson read to them for their learning. But they will not; they are in the state of mind of an individual of some eminence as a metropolitan Radical, who once said to me, "*You* tell us about the Corn-laws, and Mr. Roebuck tells us about Canada, but *we* care neither for Canada nor the Corn-laws, we want to see some reduction of taxation." The very counterpart, in short, of the peasant of the middle ages, who knew no importance in anything beyond his village, and was duly cut to pieces by men at arms when he rose against the intolerable pressure of a *gabelle*.

I maintain it, Sir, against all opponents, that decent liberty and safety from oppression, is an art, a craft, a mystery, and like other crafts and mysteries must be acquired with effort and preserved with pains. And for this plain reason, that there is continually at work an art, a craft, a mystery, on the other side, or more properly a whole congregation of mysteries playing into one another's hands, composed of all who have anything to get by injuring the classes least able to resist, who in other words may be stated to be, with rare exceptions, all who do not belong to them themselves. As Adam Smith said of craftsmen, that they never meet together without entering into a conspiracy against the public, so the classes who *are not* the unrepresented, are in an almost perpetual state of watchful activity, to gain a point at the expense of those who unfortunately *are*.

And now to see the play, the practice, of oppression as exercised in a distant country, by way of a sort of boxing with the gloves on, in preparation for a real set-to with the people of England when the time comes. There is no use in dwelling on past events; everybody knows that the Canadians were in possession of laws and a parliament, to the same extent that the people of England have them,—that is to say, they were allowed to talk about them, so long as it was nobody's interest

to take them away. By the legal use of their acknowledged parliamentary rights, they were in a fair way of removing a portion of the misgovernment under which they laboured, as the people of England did at the time of the Reform Bill, and will probably try to do again. They were in fact getting majorities in their parliament for Reform. Whereupon the Whig government or their agents on the spot, turned out the troops against the approaching majority; put down their parliament; hunted their Speaker with light infantry; seized the leading members, and carried them in carts through the country with ropes about their necks; fired whole counties and murdered the inhabitants, turning out women and children with unmanly brutality to perish in the snow; of their prisoners assassinated some in cold blood by pretended courts-martial, and brought others to England under circumstances of the most hideous cruelty, parading them in tyranny's black cart for the edification of the citizens of London, who never wagged a beard in comment, and then letting them go upon the demonstration that there was no legal charge against them; and finally heaped honours and rewards upon the military agents in these foul crimes, by way of antepast to those who shall deserve well by doing the like at home.

This was the past; now for the present. When you want to oppress a man, give him one vote to his enemy's five. This is the simple recipe; the prescription all over the world. Thus then it is enacted for Canada. That one little county, with 2,300 inhabitants, shall return a member; that six counties, returning members supposed to be favourable to the system of monopoly and misrule the people of England pay for out of their earnings, shall with a population of 38,000, return six members; while the counties where the people have the truly English interest,—that is to say, are interested in honest industry, and not in the monopoly whose object is to make the people of England pay for boots and then cut them into shoes,—with a joint population of 30,000, are to be entitled to return only one member among them. Even a Tory lord cannot stand the iniquity, when it is not his own party's doing. You see here the process in its nakedness. Which are the men to be oppressed? Set them down with a vote among five. Which are the men who are to oppress? Give each of them the power to trample five of his fellows into the dirt.

And now will stand up some wiseacre, after the fashion of the wiseacres who have brought us to the present pass, and will drawl out, "What is the use of complaining of the dis-

proportion of five to one in Canada, when in our own country there is a disproportion of seventy to one?" And so you will cherish the little thing, for the sake of the greater. Get up but a good main battle of abuse in the centre, and all the lesser abuses which are its outposts, shall be sacred for love of it. Look quietly at your lords and masters in parliament assembled, keeping their hands in by avowed tyranny abroad, and comfort yourselves by thinking you always know where to look for worse at home.

This is substantially the policy which numbers have acted on, and will continue. The people of England are waiting for the infliction of some rude blow upon their rights and liberties, which with prudence they might have prevented; and then they will begin to look around and back, and wish they had made provision when they saw distant vessels laid on their beam-ends by the squall. They will come to find out, that there is no security for good government, when first, the masses of the people to be governed are systematically excluded from all share in the representation, and secondly, badly chosen as the rulers purposely are, they have the further temptation of being uncontrolled by anything in the shape of constitutional law, and the "So be it and it was so" of some hundreds of very deeply interested gentlemen in their own concerns, is to be the sole measure of the safety of a nation.

What will you say, if when *we* come to try a "pettifogging parliamentary rebellion" as is the *Standard's* phrase,—in other words, when we are in a way of getting a parliamentary majority for something like a new Reform Bill,—the legislators in scarlet are turned out upon us with torches in their hands, and ourselves and families made holocausts of, as was done by direction of the Whigs in Canada? "Fore-warn'd," they say, "fore-arm'd." What I want to impress upon you is, that these men are not only not trustworthy, but that they are the most assured and dangerous enemies of the public security and of the preservation of anything like moderate personal safety and quiet, unless when they are in the position that God made them for, which is that of acting as a check upon other men's hostility. They are a kind of dogs who as long as they are outside the pale, may be made to act against the wolves who would devour the flock; but the moment they are let inside, begin to eat the sheep themselves. They have had their trial, and they were found with the mutton in their mouths. The blood of mangled Canada is sticking to their jaws; and they may think themselves lucky dogs indeed, if

they find themselves sent back to their occupation outside, with no talk of hanging by the way.

One point is too odd to be omitted. A particular request is advanced, that honourable gentlemen will not divide, for the sake of unanimity. On going to Ireland some years ago as a regimental officer, I was desirous to make a collection on the spot, of that peculiar kind of trope or figure the English designate by "bull;" and decidedly the best specimen was this. I was dining with a dignitary of the law, whose guests in general were of his own profession; and after dinner the conversation ran on their professional matters. "Major," at length said my host, "you must excuse us for talking about our own affairs; but in this country, we make a point of never mentioning politics or religion, *for the sake of unanimity.*" The *unanimity*, of men who could not mention the concerns of either this world or the next, for fear of quarrelling! Just so it is here; the friends of justice, if there were any, were invited to hold their tongues, and so to be unanimous. And why were they to hold their tongues? Why were they to give the semblance of their acquiescence, in what they knew to have been illegal, unconstitutional, treasonable, sanguinary, and in a multitude of ways worthy of death by the hand of the public executioner? All that can be said now is, Mark these unanimous gentlemen. Ask them at the election which is not far off, whether they were of those who assented to treason for the sake of unanimity. And see if you are not led to the conclusion, that to the mingled treachery and imbecillity of the tribe of men who style themselves "good reformers," you are indebted for all the opportunities thrown away, and all the mischiefs you are like to have instead.

London, 21 *July*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XIX.

ENGLAND, TURKEY, AND EGYPT.—THE HOLY ALLIANCE IN THE EAST.—WHY MOHAMMED ALI WAS TO BE PUT DOWN.—THE THROAT-CUTTING IN CHINA.

SIR,—Every day confirms the evidence, that the sooner the porcelain cup is got out of the hands of the present men the better. Their true place is as a counterpoise; you might as

well take the pigs of ballast out of a frigate's hold, and hang them here and there in the rigging to help the sailing, as remove the Whig lords and gentlemen from the only thing they are fit for. They have not principles of public morality, nor knowledge of the world and of the final connexion there is between sin and suffering even in a political sense, to enable them to resist the temptations to which office exposes feeble and indifferently well-meaning people. Take them out of office and set them to be a watch on other men's offences, and then they know pretty well that murder is murder, and treason treason, and there is good hope of turning their tenderness of conscience for other men's actions, to account.

Two questions have been raised in parliament in the last week, one new and one old, which show how the child unborn may rue these men having quitted office a fortnight later instead of sooner. The first is, in the technical phrase (or, as the Frenchman said, the phrase used for the purpose of concealment of ideas) the "Eastern question;" which means resuscitating the dry bones of the Holy Alliance, to put down the progress of liberal ideas in Egypt. It is within the memory of all of us who have white in our beards, that if any country in the world displayed the miseries of the absence of all just and orderly government, it was Egypt. Ask travellers, ask the literati of Europe, whether it was not the representation of a Zoological Garden, in which all the beasts, carnivorous and not, were turned out to use their discretion upon each other. This was the government, or no government, of the sublime the Ottoman Porte. But as all mischiefs have a tendency to wear themselves out, if Lords and Whigs will let them, there arose in the course of nature or Providence, a remarkable individual who like Peter of Russia laid hold of the only instrument that in such a bear-garden can make itself felt, a military force, and successfully putting down all opponents, declared at the cannon's mouth, that robbery and intestine war should cease, that more was to be got by honest commerce than by plunder (would our legislators were half as well-informed), and commerce and industry should exist accordingly; and absolutely made of this howling wilderness a land of peace and quiet, in which our women and children on their way to India are to be seen at this hour trotting in the newest-constructed omnibus till the railways are finished, under the guard of the very sons of Ishmael who forty years ago would have sold them to the best bidder to people his seraglio. This same individual has a force by land and sea, which may be represented in the rough by a hundred thousand men. And this force he is laying at

your feet; he is saying to you with the earnestness of home-felt interest in your alliance, "Is there any object of desire or of security, which I by means of this force can be the instrument of procuring for you?" "I have created, he says to you, a new country to commerce; if you are, as I have heard, a great trading nation, trade here; it is the land most famous in antiquity for its wealth and produce, and it happens to be the road to the Indian possessions which you value. We were made for you and you for us; let us be friends. We stretch out our hands towards you."

Alas, the ruler of Egypt, acute as he may be, overlooked one fact. He did not recollect that we had an aristocracy, the bitter enemies of honest industry, and bent upon living by the easier road of violence and wrong;—in short, that we wanted *Mohammed-Ali-izing* here, as much in one way as Egypt ever did in another. Of what use is it that mountainous prospects of advantage are opened to British industry in general; there shall be a little speck of conceived gain to some obscure aristocratic interest that shall overshadow them all. Hearken to the reason. The evils of Egypt forty years ago, were under a most legitimate government. The reforms that put an end to them, were of course not legitimate, and in fact carried on, like all other reforms, in defiance of legitimacy's best efforts. A dozen times perhaps, has the sublime legitimate sent a missive to the Reformer, with orders to bring away the Reformer's head *if he could.* Here then is the sticking-place. A Whig lord or two, here and at Constantinople, are anxious to see that legitimacy takes no harm. They look for honour and glory, not certainly from the British people, but from the coteries of their caste, for having held out a helping hand to the misgovernors of Egypt, and checked the natural course of concession and conciliation between the new reforming power and the old amalgamation of abuse. And for this maggot of the Whig lords aforesaid, we are threatened with a rupture with France, which rightfully considers itself ill-treated in the compact made behind its back with its old and irreconcileable enemies the Holy Alliance. Now could not we find snuff-boxes;—would it not be a cheap way to pour gewgaws and love-tokens till they were sick of them, upon these aspirants after renewing on a small scale the glories of old times;—sooner than see Europe involved in general war, that a brace or so of Whig Lords may dance round the council-table, and snap their fingers with delight that they too have been legitimates? We pay enormous taxes, and fit out huge squadrons, simply that these men may have toys to do mischief with. What made them fit for the charge;

was it their education, their knowledge, their talents? They learned, it may be, to steal geese at Eton; and the rest, it is likely, is as might be expected. And thus it is, that the public interests go to wreck to please a lord, just as in France before the Revolution they went to please a lady.

The other question brought up, was the old one of the war with China. The principal argument advanced against the non-highwaymen, was contained in a vast expression of wonder, *what use* they expected to come of their opposition. In other words they were told, that orders had been sent to cut the throat, and that it was not within the power of man to be in time to stop the operation. But was there no use in saving private honour and individual character? Was there no use in a man's being able to go to his constituents and say, "I have done what in me lay to relieve myself and you from the personal degradation in the eyes of our neighbours and their wives and children, which would have resulted from being supposed to have connived at this national disgrace?" If our rulers chuse to be cut-throats and banditti, why are we to keep terms with them any more than with their fellows of lower degree? It comes to this. The people of England are not robbers, though their rulers are. And they view the proceedings of these rulers, as an honest man (if such were there) might have viewed those of the rulers in the piratical states of Barbary; with a sense of individual degradation in being forced to submit to them, and a strong consciousness of the danger heaped on his individual head by the involuntary connexion.

It all ends in this. That we are a nation whose government is at the mercy of portions of the community, in morals and understanding vastly below the average of the whole. That evil is wrapping round us from this cause in all directions; and that the wisest thing we can do, is to bestir ourselves to use the powers we have, in order to obtain the power of protecting ourselves from the consequences of other men's ignorance and crimes, which at present we have not.

London, 29 *July*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XX.

THOMAS CARLYLE'S "CHARTISM."—THE "CONDITION-OF-ENGLAND" QUESTION.—WHY PARLIAMENTS HAVE AVAILED NOTHING.

SIR,—In the debate on China alluded to in my last, I overlooked the assertion of the official defender of the disgrace inflicted on us in that particular quarter, that there were not

twenty individuals in the country who sympathized with the honest mover of the opposition.

I doubt whether any member of parliament has a right to make such a Gomorrah of his country.

The Punishment of Death Restriction Bill has been thrown out, by the active interference of the ministerial leader in the House of Commons.

I hope the noble lord may live, like Phalaris, to be roasted in his own bull.

A Bishop in the House of Lords is serving out "the justice of Almighty God," (of which he plainly conceives himself the conduit), on occasion of the Irish Municipal Corporations Bill.

What airs of superior light would John Bull give himself, if a Bishop in Spain or Portugal was found dealing God's vengeance round the land on occasion of a Liberal alteration in the Municipal Law.

Great wonderment has been expressed in the House of Commons, that John Thorogood did not have some friend to pay the five-and-sixpence for him and have done.

Is it recorded of any of the early Christians who were in jeopardy for refusing to throw a few grains of incense into the fire, that they kept an orthodox friend to do a bit of idolatry for them when wanted?

When a member in the House of Commons promised a motion to the Queen to stop the infamy in China, the representatives of the "Forty Thieves" laughed.

Such laughter is ominous. Psalm-singing and the chaplain of Newgate often come next.

Skirmishing like this prepares the mind for applying itself to what other men have said of serious and weighty, on the subject which whether treated lightly or solemnly, is equally and will be, at the bottom of the meditations of thinking people. And here we have a coadjutor in a writer writing his work down "Chartism," who has never been taxed with being a democrat run mad; but who on the contrary has every appearance of being disposed, like Walter Scott, to keep on good terms with all powers that be, and if he practically serves another cause, does it from the love of the picturesque and the real, rather than any partiality for the side he draws.

Let us begin with Thomas Carlyle's motto. "It never smokes but there is fire." *Or will be,*—might have been added with advantage. We are just now in the "wet hay-stack" condition; a man may thrust in his arm and have it as hot as he likes. Truly does the author say, that this condition "is a rathe'

ominous matter at present;" neither is he far wrong in adding, "that something ought to be said, something ought to be done, in regard of it." But what shall be said, what shall be done?

"Chartism," proceeds the author, "means the bitter discon-"tent grown fierce and mad, the wrong condition therefore or "the wrong disposition, of the working classes of England. "It is a new name for a thing which has had many names, "which will yet have many. The matter of Chartism is "weighty, deep-rooted, far-extending; did not begin yester-"day; will by no means end this day or to-morrow."

In this there is right and wrong. That Chartism is the bitter discontent, is most true; whether it be fierce and mad, is as shall turn out. That it is the wrong condition, those who feel it know; that it is the wrong disposition, is what enemies may salve themselves with if they like.

"We have heard it asked, Why Parliament throws no light "on this question of the Working Classes, and the condition "or disposition they are in? Truly to a remote observer of "Parliamentary procedure it seems surprising, especially in "late Reformed times, to see what space this question occupies "in the Debates of the Nation. Can any other business what-"soever be so pressing on legislators? A Reformed Parliament, "one would think, should inquire into popular discontents "*before* they get the length of pikes and torches! For what "end at all are men, Honourable Members and Reform Mem-"bers, sent to St. Stephen's, with clamour and effort; kept "talking, struggling, motioning, and counter-motioning? "The condition of the great body of people in a country is the "condition of the country itself: this you would say is a truism "in all times; a truism rather pressing to get recognised as a "truth now, and be acted upon, in these times. Yet read Han-"sard's Debates, or the Morning Papers, if you have nothing "to do. The old grand question, whether A is to be in office "or B, with the innumerable subsidiary questions growing out "of that, courting paragraphs and suffrages for a blessed solu-"tion of that: Canada question, Irish Appropriation question, "West India question, Queen's Bedchamber question; Game "Laws, Usury Laws; African Blacks, Hill Coolies, Smithfield "cattle, and Dog-carts,—all manner of questions and subjects, "except simply this alpha and omega of all! Surely Honour-"able Members ought to speak of the Condition-of-England "question too. Radical Members, above all; friends of the "people; chosen with effort, by the people, to interpret and "articulate the dumb deep want of the people! To a remote "observer they seem oblivious of their duty. Are they

"not there, by trade, mission, and express appointment of "themselves and others, to speak for the good of the British "Nation? Whatsoever great British interest can the least "speak for itself, for that beyond all they are called to speak. "They are either speakers for that great dumb toiling class "which cannot speak, or they are nothing that one can well "specify."

"Alas, the remote observer knows not the nature of Parlia- "ments: how Parliaments, extant there for the British "Nation's sake, find that they are extant withal for their own "sake; how Parliaments travel so naturally in their deep- "rutted routine, common-place worn into ruts axle-deep, from "which only strength, insight and courageous generous exer- "tion can lift any Parliament or vehicle; how in Parliaments, "Reformed or Unreformed, there may chance to be a strong "man, an original, clear-sighted, great-hearted, patient and "valiant man, or to be none such;—how, on the whole, Parlia- "ments, lumbering along in their deep ruts of common-place, "find, as so many of us otherwise do, that the ruts *are* axle- "deep, and the travelling very toilsome of itself, and for the "day the evil thereof sufficient! What Parliaments ought to "have done in this business, what they will, can or cannot yet "do, and where the limits of their faculty and culpability may "lie, in regard to it, were a long investigation; into which "we need not enter at this moment. What they have done is "unhappily plain enough. Hitherto, on this most national of "questions, the Collective Wisdom of the Nation has availed "us as good as nothing whatever."

The reason may be briefly given. The parliaments he speaks of, were not the Collective wisdom but the Collective knavery. They were what they were formed, framed, and expressly calculated to be. They were the expressions of the wishes and interests of the small and wealthy classes, to the distinct exclusion, except by romantic accident, of even the mention or annunciation of the wishes and interests of the numerous and the poor. As a potter takes clay and makes of it a vessel as pleases him, so parliaments and the mode of entering into them were expressly moulded to suit the purposes designed. As nobody makes a hole in his vessel where he desires it to hold water, or stops the passage where he intends that fluid should run out, so the contrivers and builders of parliaments took care by the very constitution of what they made, that the interests of the aristocracy should be preserved, and the interests of the people should drop through.

"What are the rights, what are the mights, of the discon-

"tented Working Classes in England at this epoch? He were "an Œdipus, and deliverer from sad social pestilence, who "could resolve us fully! For we may say beforehand, The "struggle that divides the upper and lower in society over "Europe, and more painfully and notably in England than "elsewhere, this too is a struggle which will end and adjust "itself as all other struggles do and have done, by making the "right clear and the might clear; not otherwise than by that. "Meantime, the questions, Why are the Working Classes dis-"contented; what is their condition, economical, moral, in "their houses and their hearts, as it is in reality and as they "figure it to themselves to be; what do they complain of; what "ought they, and ought they not to complain of?—these are "measurable questions; on some of these any common mortal, "did he but turn his eyes to them, might throw some light."

How do the wealthier classes preserve themselves in contentment? Not by settling that none of their class shall enter parliament. On the contrary, they make a law, that none but themselves shall be there; the last thing that would content them, would be that their interests should have such representation as they might receive out of sheer honesty at the hands of men whose personal interests lay the other way. Not, either, by indulging themselves with what a Whig calls virtual representation; which means the power of utterance by good luck, but with nobody to back the utterer with votes. On the contrary, they contend as jealously for what shall give a vote on this side or on that, as if speech without votes was of no value at all. *Why are the Working Classes discontented?*

"What constitutes the well-being of a man? Many things; "of which the wages he gets, and the bread he buys with them, "are but one preliminary item. Grant, however, that the "wages were the whole; that once knowing the wages and "the price of bread, we know all; then what are the wages? "Statistic inquiry, in its present unguided condition, cannot "tell. The average rate of day's wages is not correctly ascer-"tained for any portion of this country; not only not for "half-centuries, it is not even ascertained anywhere for decades "or years: far from instituting comparisons with the past, the "present itself is unknown to us. And then, given the aver-"age of wages, what is the constancy of employment; what is "the difficulty of finding employment; the fluctuation from "season to season, from year to year? Is it constant, calcu-"lable wages; or fluctuating, incalculable, more or less of the "nature of gambling? This secondary circumstance, of

"quality in wages, is perhaps even more important than the "primary one of quantity. Farther we ask, Can the labourer, "by thrift and industry, hope to rise to mastership; or is such "hope cut off from him? How is he related to his employer; "by bonds of friendliness and mutual help; or by hostility, "opposition, and chains of mutual necessity alone? In a word, "what degree of contentment can a human creature be sup- "posed to enjoy in that position? With hunger preying on "him, his contentment is likely to be small! But even with "abundance, his discontent, his real misery may be great. "The labourer's feelings, his notions of being justly dealt with "or unjustly; his wholesome composure, frugality, prosperity "in the one case, his acrid unrest, recklessness, gin-drinking, "and gradual ruin in the other,—how shall figures of arith- "metic represent all this? So much is still to be ascertained; "much of it by no means easy to ascertain! Till, among the "'Hill Cooly' and 'Dog-Cart' questions, there arise in Parlia- "ment and extensively out of it a 'Condition-of-England' "question, and quite a new set of inquirers and methods, little "of it is likely to be ascertained."

Heaven forbid that the "Condition-of-England" question should ever be laid hold of by parliaments as they are. The "Dog-cart" question is enough and too much for them; for even of that they could make nothing, but how most effectually to oppress without a hearing, the wretches who were base enough to be so poor as to drive dogs. It was a mere ebullition of those who drive horses because other people pay for them. To undertake, or pretend to undertake, a "Condition-of-England" question, would be only the prelude to a series of solemn frauds carried on from decade to decade and from half-century to half-century, to end, if it was ever convenient to end it, in such a verdict as a jury would give where every man had been sworn to a life-interest in the dispute. Truly was it added, that there must be "quite a new set of inquirers and methods." There must be somebody whose interest it is to find something by inquiry, and to take methods to some result.

But there is a degree of weakness about the importance attached to these inquiries at all. If the author had not elsewhere given evidence of sincerity, he might be in danger of being charged with wanting to set up a "Statistical-Inquiry" *hum.* When a man falls down choked with his neck-cloth, we do not begin by counting the symptoms and waiting to make statistic tables of the effects of pressure on the carotid. Nature has bestowed on us a homely faculty, of going a nearer way to work. The dullest of us has the power of seeing, that there is a cause in action competent to produce the mischief felt, and

that to remove this cause, and not to be counting the symptoms, is the part of men of sense. It is known to everybody, except the Chartists, that the first move of the self-appointed legislators for the working classes, was to say to them, "You shall have a shilling wages instead of sixpence, on condition that the shilling shall only buy as much of what *we* sell, as fourpence did before." And this gross and baby-like strategem, ending in making the Working Classes give three hours' work for their dinner instead of two, the Working Classes or the active and talking part of them, were found utterly incompetent to penetrate. After this, that an aristocratic lecturer should rest the remedy on knowing how many twists and convulsions the choking man has gone through per decade, is lightly to be wondered at.

On the New Poor-Law the author is most picturesque; though he does not appear to have hit upon the crowning wrong, that all this was done by the men who were at the same time making laws to prevent the poor from keeping themselves. But read what he has said, in all places where the sons and daughters of "The Unrepresented" are gathered together.

"To read the Reports of the Poor-Law Commissioners, if "one had faith enough, would be a pleasure to the friend of "humanity. One sole recipe seems to have been needful for "the woes of England: 'refusal of out-door relief.' England "lay in sick discontent, writhing powerlessly on its fever-bed, "dark, nigh desperate, in wastefulness, want, improvidence, "and eating care, till like Hyperion down the eastern steeps, "the Poor-Law Commissioners arose, and said, Let there be "workhouses, and bread of affliction and water of affliction "there! It was a simple invention; as all truly great inven-"tions are. And see, in any quarter, instantly as the walls of "the workhouse arise, misery and necessity fly away, out of "sight,—out of being, as is fondly hoped, and dissolve into the "inane; industry, frugality, fertility, rise of wages, peace on "earth and good will towards men do,—in the Poor-Law "Commissioners' Reports,—infallibly, rapidly or not so rapidly, "to the joy of all parties, supervene."

This is one side. Hear another.

"That this Poor-Law Amendment Act meanwhile should "be, as we sometimes hear it named, the 'chief glory' of a "Reform Cabinet, betokens, one would imagine, rather a "scarcity of glory there. To say to the poor, Ye shall eat the "bread of affliction and drink the water of affliction, and be "very miserable while here, required not so much a stretch of "heroic faculty in any sense, as due toughness of bowels. If

"paupers are made miserable, paupers will needs decline in "multitude. It is a secret known to all rat-catchers: stop up "the granary-crevices, afflict with continual mewing, alarm, "and going-off of traps, your 'chargeable labourers' disappear, "and cease from the establishment. A still briefer method is "that of arsenic; perhaps even a milder, where otherwise per- "missible. Rats and paupers can be abolished; the human "faculty was of old adequate to grind them down, slowly or at "once, and needed no ghost or Reform Ministry to teach it."

Remark one point, which the author has omitted;—that the killing is not once for all, but is a perpetual process. Outcry has been made, and rightly, against one "Marcus," who proposed keeping down the infant population by "painless extinction." The New Poor-Law Commissioners drown old cats instead of kittens;—that's all. The law-makers will keep themselves and families, as why should they not? But all other families in the country, in their nearer or remoter branches, must come to the establishments of these Marcuses for adults, and there by a process like what children admire in a coffee-mill, be all ground down in time, though a refractory berry shall make many efforts to save itself by leaping out of the jaws of the grinder and struggling to the top. It is a process calculated, inevitable, of geometric certainty; it is for it that senates meet, and councils are gathered together.

"To whatever other griefs the lower classes labour under, "this bitterest and sorest grief now superadds itself: the un- "endurable conviction that they are unfairly dealt with, that "their lot in this world is not founded on right, not even on "necessity and might, is neither what it should be, nor what "it shall be."

"Or why do we ask of Chartism, Glasgow Trades-unions, "and such like? Has not broad Europe heard the question "put, and answered, on the great scale: has not a FRENCH "REVOLUTION been? Since the year 1789, there is now half "a century complete; and a French Revolution not yet com- "plete! Whosoever will look at that enormous Phenomenon "may find many meanings in it, but this meaning is the "ground of all: That it was a revolt of the oppressed lower "classes against the oppressing or neglecting upper classes: "not a French revolt only; no, a European one; full of stern "monition to all countries of Europe. These Chartisms, "Radicalisms, Reform Bill, Tithe Bill; and infinite other "discrepancy, and acrid argument and jargon that there is yet "to be, are *our* French Revolution: God grant that we, with "our better methods, may be able to transact it by argument "alone!"

This is speaking out. If you or I had said it, we should have been voted dangerous. Therefore we say it by the mouth of another.

"The French Revolution is seen, or begins everywhere to "be seen, 'as the crowning phenomenon of our Modern Time: "the inevitable stern end of much; the fearful, but also won- "derful, indispensable, and sternly beneficent beginning of "much.' He who would understand the struggling con- "vulsive unrest of European society, in any and every country, "at this day, may read it in broad glaring lines there, in that "the most convulsive phenomenon of the last thousand years. "Europe lay pining, obstructed, moribund; quack-ridden, "hag-ridden,—is there a hag, or spectre of the Pit, so baleful, "hideous as your accredited quack, were he never so close- "shaven, mild-spoken, plausible to himself and others? Quack- "ridden: in that one word lies all misery whatsoever."

Roll into one all the quacks that ever sounded brass before them, and what an infant quackery do they make, in comparison of that nest of well-dressed gentlemen, who first kept everybody but themselves out of the House of Commons, and then told the Working Classes the diminution of bread was fatness!

How natural a consequence it is after this, that—

"The faith of men is dead: in what has guineas in its pocket, "beefeaters riding behind it, and cannons trundling before it, "they can believe; in what has none of these things they cannot "believe. Sense for the true or false is lost; there is properly no "longer any true or false. It is the heyday of Imposture; of "Semblance recognizing itself, and getting itself recognized, "for Substance. Gaping multitudes listen; unlistening multi- "tudes see not but that all is right, and in the order of Nature. "Earnest men, one of a million, shut their lips, suppressing "thoughts, which there are no words to utter."

There is too much good here, to be lost by forced abbreviation. So the rest, another time.

London, 5 *August*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXI.

THOMAS CARLYLE'S "CHARTISM," CONTINUED.—"LET ALONE."—NOT GUIDANCE BUT MISGUIDANCE.—THE FEAST OF HOT WATER.—THE RECIPES.

SIR,—There is good, where good can be got; it matters not whether by agreement or collision. Proceed we then on the same principle of trying to find good in everything.

"In brief, a government of the under classes by the upper on a prin-
"ciple of *let alone* is no longer possible in England in these days. This is
"the one inference inclusive of all."

There must be some great mistake or misunderstanding here. When did they ever *let us alone?* The complaint against them is, that their action upon us has been unceasing, premeditated, calculated, for evil. That they have been a machine curiously and wonderfully made, to be about our path and about our bed, and meet us everywhere, suggesting the idea of a depraved and perverted omnipotence, with proof that if we take the wings of the morning, they are there, and though we flee to the uttermost parts of the earth, we shall not escape them. And not us only, but all other classes except themselves; as will be found out some day, when those other classes have suffered enough to make them lay aside their stupid hatred of what they consider their inferiors, their blind animosity against all they suspect of taking part with them, and their conceit that they would ever have been their own deliverers from the dupery they labour under. And herein lies our strength. The misgoverning classes have let *nothing and nobody* alone. To have been "let alone" would have been the same sort of escape, as to be let alone by any other carnivorous animal, from a tiger to a flea. Nothing has been too grandly mischievous, or too pettily vexatious, for their doing. In the great style, they have laid their bann on the wealth and power of the country, by the same dull fallacy as if a builder should construct each of our line-of-battle ships at the cost of three, and hold out the results as evidence of naval greatness. In the small way, they keep a perpetual paddling with the poor man's drink, as if the state would be ruined if he swallowed anything but as the Justice shall direct; and they embitter his hour of rest with the revival of obsolete religious tyrannies, scouted by the leaders of the Protestant faith who imperilled their lives in the cause of religious freedom, as contrary to the express directions of Scripture, and no "other thynges but snares of consciences." They are horribly mistaken, if they think anybody has been "let alone." And yet it arose from no preternatural pleasure in evil, any more than in the case of the tiger or the flea. As those two blood-suckers on different scales of magnitude, are prompted by the common reason that it is for the satisfaction of their natural appetites, so it was with the others. The fault was not in them, but in those who quietly saw a dynasty of tigers or of fleas taking charge of the national concerns, and stood bawling in honour of the glorious settlement to which we had attained. No man, and no animal, is

much to blame, for taking what he is allowed and encouraged to take; the fault is with those who let him, or who stupidly look on, seeing all the while that the organization is expressly made and framed for carrying us to the negative side of *being let alone.* Before we come to anything to be done for us, we want to arrive at stopping that which is done against us. We want, in short, to be governed by something directly the opposite of an organization, which secures the sacrificing of the interests of the many to the interests of the few, wherever they shall come in competition.

"The Working Classes cannot any longer go on without government "[it should have been said, *with such* government]; without being *actually* "guided and governed [it should have been added, in their own interest "and not in the interest of somebody else]; England cannot subsist in "peace till, by some means or other, some [there should have been added "*such*] guidance and government for them is found."

"For, alas, on us too the rude truth has come home, wrappages and "speciosities all worn off, the haggard naked fact speaks to us: Are these "millions taught? Are these millions guided? We have a Church, the "venerable embodiment of an idea which may well call itself divine; "which our fathers for long ages, feeling it to be divine, have been em-"bodying as we see: it is a Church well furnished with equipments and "appurtenances; educated in universities, rich in money; set on high "places that it may be conspicuous to all, honoured of all. We have an "Aristocracy of landed wealth and commercial wealth, in whose hands "lies the law-making and the law-administering; an Aristocracy rich, "powerful, long secure in its place; an Aristocracy with more faculty put "free into its hands than was ever before, in any country or time, put into "the hands of any class of men. This Church answers: Yes, the people "are taught. This Aristocracy, astonishment in every feature, answers: "Yes, surely the people are guided! Do we not pass what Acts of Parlia-"ment are needful; as many as thirty-nine for the shooting of the partridges "alone? Are there not tread-mills, gibbets; even hospitals, poor-rates, "New Poor Law? So answers Church; so answers Aristocracy, astonish-"ment in every feature."

We have a Church which teaches practice and the rule of three, by exercises on the number of murders commanded by the priesthood of a barbarous tribe; and stops all other education that it can. We have a Church which shuts men up in prison for refusing to pay, what if the case were of demanding Peter's pence from itself, it would declare to be the height of persecution and wrong; and is obliged to have a special act of parliament, to take the victims out of its claws before the general resurrection. We have a Church whose yesterday's operation was to present petitions against the law which allows prisoners to be defended by counsel; because the Church's

idea is that prisoners should be condemned without. We have a Church and bench that combine together to bear harmless the violators of girls who cannot say their catechisms, and admit to evidence such as avow their credence in "old Bogie." We have an Aristocracy that first makes it unlawful for industry to keep itself, and then cuts off the provision for the poor. Surely we are taught! Surely we are guided!

"What is the meaning of the 'five points,' if we will understand them? "What are all popular commotions and maddest bellowings, from Peter- "loo to the Place de Grêve itself? Bellowings, *in*articulate cries as of a "dumb creature in rage and pain; to the ear of wisdom they are inarti- "culate prayers: Guide me, govern me! I am mad, and miserable, and "cannot guide myself!"

No more mad than you. We are ready to render any man a reason for the hope that is in us. We know that we have been guided by the blindest leaders of the blind, by men who purposely put themselves there to keep out any that should see. We know that at this moment we exhibit the spectacle of a moderately moral and intelligent nation, guided by its felons and its fools; and we know that there is a distinct organization not only for keeping out of power the honester and wiser classes, but as far as possible for preventing their voice from being heard in any effective place, and even the matter of their complaint being known. And on the very badness of the case, is founded our hope aforesaid, to wit that it cannot last. We think we see the hand of Providence leading our drivers to some salutary quagmire, where the coach shall be upset with tolerable softness, to the great joy of us the passengers both inside and out. Our affections are all set upon being turned over gently; if we were fools enough to holla with the guard and coachman at starting, we have long been cured of such irrational demonstrations. We have been driven, and with a vengeance; what we want, is to cease being driven the wrong way, and then to be driven the other.

"Parliamentary Radicalism, while it gave articulate utterance to the "discontent of the English people, could not by its worst enemy be said to "be without a function. If it is in the natural order of things that there "*must* be discontent, no less so is it that such discontent should have an "outlet, a Parliamentary voice. Here the matter is debated of, demon- "strated, contradicted, qualified, reduced to feasibility;—can at least "solace itself with hope, and die gently, convinced of *un*feasibility."

This was only Parliamentary Radicalism as it *should* have been. If the thing called so was something else, it is not difficult to surmise what is to come after.

"How Parliamentary Radicalism has fulfilled this mission, entrusted "to its management these eight years now, is known to all men. The ex- "pectant millions have sat at a feast of the Barmecide; being bidden fill "themselves with the imagination of meat. What thing has Radicalism "obtained for them; what other than shadows of things has it so much as "asked for them?"

The way this came was clear enough. The Irish leader, who had the greatest disposable force, exchanged the further progress of Reform for promises in Ireland; and the English leaders such as they were, joined in for the sake of certain Irish boroughs, some of which they got and some not. The mass of the Parliamentary Radicals so called, were men of neither nerve nor system, anxious only for the general success of the compact which was to keep in power the ministers with whom they thought their own importance bound up; the last sort of persons, in short, from whom any resistance was to be expected. And so the people had their feast of hot water; which was as good as they deserved, for not having their wits about them. Their opposition should have been made when the first dish was set on the table; which was when the English pretended Radical leaders were found jobbing three-deep for Kilkenny.

"But now in these circumstances shall we blame the unvoting disap- "pointed millions that they turn away with horror from this name of a "Reform Ministry, name of a Parliamentary Radicalism, and demand a "fact and reality thereof? That they too, having still faith in what so "many had faith in, still count 'extension of the suffrage' the one thing "needful; and say, in such manner as they can, Let the suffrage be still "extended, *then* all will be well? It is the ancient British faith; promul- "gated in these ages by prophets and evangelists; preached from barrel- "heads by all manner of men. He who is free and blessed has his twenty- "thousandth part of a master of tongue-fence in National Palaver; whoso- "ever is not blessed but unhappy, the ailment of him is that he has it not. "Ought he not to have it then? By the law of God and of men, yea;— "and will have it withal; Chartism, with its 'five points,' borne aloft on "pike-heads and torchlight meetings, is there. Chartism is one of the "most natural phenomena in England. Not that Chartism now exists "should provoke wonder; but that the invited hungry people should have "sat eight years at such table of the Barmecide, patiently expecting some- "what from the name of a Reform Ministry, and not till after eight years "have grown hopeless, this is the respectable side of the miracle."

One thing may at all events be averred;—that he who is not to have a twenty-thousandth-part of a voice in National Palaver, is neither free nor blessed.

"But what are we to do? exclaims the practical man, impatiently on "every side: 'Descend from speculation and the safe pulpit, down into the "rough market-place, and say what can be done!'—O practical man,

"there seem very many things which practice and true manlike effort in "Parliament and out of it, might actually avail to do. But the first of all "things, as already said, is to gird thyself up for actual doing."

Follow, two recipes; one good; the other naught, because the author does not understand it.

"Universal Education is the first great thing we mean; general Emi-"gration is the second."

"Heavier wrong is not done under the sun. It lasts from year to year, "from century to century; the blinded sire slaves himself out, and leaves a "blinded son; and men, made in the image of God, continue as two-legged "beasts of labour;—and in the largest empire of the world, it is a debate "whether a small fraction of the Revenue of one Day (£30,000 is but "that) shall, after Thirteen Centuries, be laid out on it, or not laid out on "it. Have we Governors, have we Teachers; have we had a Church these "thirteen hundred years? What is an Overseer of souls, an Arch-overseer, "Archiepiscopus? Is he something? If so, let him lay his hand on his "heart, and say what thing!"

Alas, the great hinderance is, that we have had a Church, and have it still. The same anti-education devil that in America enters into a planter, in the old country enters into a bishop. The planter has no objection to the negro being educated in cane-cutting, though even there he has some dread of the art of cutting being directed against himself. The English ecclesiastical power has the same desire to limit education, and for the same cause.

If a satire were intended on the government of a country, in what terms could it be couched more forcibly, than by complimenting it on having brought on a necessity for "general emigration?" The author's eyes want further opening; he sees men only as trees walking. When God has given us a country overflowing with the means of procuring all wealth under the sun, what a tamely cheated generation we must be, to be told to go and gather pig-nuts in the wilderness, on pain and peril of seeing ourselves turned into "a work-shop for Europe!"

I have thus, Sir, endeavoured as far as the space would allow, to make your readers acquainted with a book, in which there is much that is worth being known, much that may be improved to use; though on the whole a considerable lack of end and point, except as matter is given for others to supply it. If a demand were made for the addition of this missing tail-piece in the fewest words, it would perhaps be in the advice, that the people should "use the little power they have, to obtain the power they have not."

P. S. With your permission, as I have had the honour of being in some sort persecuted for having read the Greek

Testament in the original and thence drawn the same conclusions with "John Duke of Saxon elector" and the other nursing-fathers of genuine Protestantism, I will send you in an early letter, from the copies in the British Museum, the entire chapter "of the Power of the Church" in the Confession of Augsburg, signed in 1530 on the part of seven temporal princes and two senates, and supported by Melancthon as their spiritual coadjutor; with the translation as given in the black letter of "The confession of the faythe of the Garmaynes "exibited to the mouste victorious Emperor Charles the v, "1530. Imprinted at London in Fletestrete, by me Robert "Redman, dwellynge at the sygne of the George nexte to "Seynte Dunstones Churche. *Cum Privilegio Regali.*" Of which, truth to say, the Latin original is sometimes the easier of the two. Here you will see the opinion of the fathers of Protestantism, touching "the obseruation and kepynge of the "Sonday, of Easter, of Penthecoste, and lyke holydayes and "rytes." I am bound to express my obligation to a correspondent of the "Birmingham Journal," for pointing out this important document.

London, 12 *August*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXII.

THE ROCHDALE CHURCH-RATE.—THE CHURCH'S "RAW."—ARGUMENTS.—THAT IT IS LAW.—THAT PROPERTY WAS GOT SUBJECT TO THE RATE.—THAT THE CHURCH IS THE TRUE CHURCH.—THE CHURCH TRIED BY ITS OWN RULE.—NEW PROTESTANTISM.

SIR,—Perceiving that public attention in your vicinity is attracted to the proceedings at Rochdale on the subject of Church Rates, I take the opportunity of addressing myself to that question.

And here we may start with laying it down as a principle, that no man in this world must expect to have too absolute or abstract justice. As the proverb avers that each of us in his life-time must eat a peck of dust, so we cannot be rigorously nice about the purity of everything presented to our swallow; all we can stand upon is, that certain limits shall not be passed, as for instance that we shall not be invited to eat

dirt because it is dirt, or have the disagreeableness of swallowing increased by having our attention drawn to the fact that it is dirty, and that we are to be made to swallow it by force.

Now there was manifestly a great deal of uncleanly injustice about the advancement of the principle, that after an overbearing and ill-conducted religious domination (for such there is no doubt the power of the church of Rome in England had merged into) had been upset by a combination of circumstances mainly based after all upon popular disapproval, the rich investments of that church should have been seized upon and appropriated in perpetuity to one sect or segment only, among the many that did or ever might exist. It was a hard thing, for instance, that the tithes and church lands, or such of them as did not find their way into the hands of the lay innovators of the time, should have been seized at one gulp, for a single sect or segment of religious belief, to the exclusion of all others for all time. It might be a great oversight in the captors, that they did not in some way attach the enjoyment of the prize, to something like a fair division among the different creeds which were or were to be; and that instead of this they should have proclaimed, that the portion of the public property set apart for the maintenance of professed religious teachers, was to belong to the proprietors or their representatives so long only as they should continue firmly to believe in certain dozens of articles which certain scores of individuals should agree then and there to indite. All this may have been profoundly foolish and unreasonable, when examined through the glasses of modern judgment and improved experience. But still there was excuse. Men were bolting in a hurry out of one religious tyranny, and it was not so wonderful they should bolt into another. The thing too is gone by, and to a great extent buried in the shadows of antiquity. To demand to cast back, and secure a fair share of the tithes and of cathedral lands, to all present and future Muggletonians, Jumpers, and Seceders of whatever hues or dimensions,—though abstractedly nothing but just and what honest men would be as anxious to grant as to demand, and what perhaps at no very remote period will actually take place through the agency of the irritation constantly maintained upon the sore,—does yet possess a portion of the difficulty which might attach to righting all the wrong that was done at the Norman conquest. And for that very reason there is a disposition in the public to evade, postpone, and deny themselves the enjoyment of that great act of national equity, at all events till the rage for justice shall be

roused by some huge mismanagement of the possessors of the spoil.

And accordant with this, are the phænomena we see, or rather we do not. The clergy in England are no where found depriving themselves of the pacific recreations of their order, and calling out crusty corporals and growling grenadiers in defence of their right to lands and rents, or even of their less popular claims to tithe. This never was enough to make a raw. The clergy must therefore ingeniously establish one by other means.

And the recipe the heads and leaders hit upon, was this; for really the inferior clergy do not seem to be the men to blame. They said, let us first take all we can for ourselves, and because the inferior clergy then can spare nothing, let us lay a tax for church expenses, on the sheep and goats alike. The sheep of course will not complain; and for the goats, what are we shepherds for, if we have no dogs. And thus they contrived to establish a source of grievance, where every man might draw his irritation fresh and brisk; a store where all tempers and appetites might suit themselves with a wrong to fit. The man who soared to theology, might mingle doubts about the sacramental forms, with his vulgar regrets at being made to pay for wine he did not mean to taste; while the man of more lath-and-plaster habits, might scowl over the sums taken from him to keep out rain with which he was in no danger of being wet, and calculate the diminution that must in consequence be made in the comforts of his own heterodox snuggery. If ever there was an invention for establishing a stout resistance at a cheap rate, it was this.

The principal arguments advanced for this impolitic imposition, are three. That it is law; that the complainants got their property subject to the rate; and that it is a privilege of the true church. Of which in order.

And first that it is law; the more's the pity. So was the slave-trade law; so was the burning of heretics law, in fact the law as it is, is only cauterizing the heretic to a somewhat smaller extent. And this leads to the secret, that the only way in this country to set any limit to the injustice of laws, is to suffer against them, to raise popular sympathy against them, and to assail them on every point where the most damage can be done them at the least comparative loss. In a country where the law is avowedly not a compact between the different members of the community for mutual good, but a compact among certain classes for obtaining the greatest practicable good for themselves through the evil of the others,

backed by all kinds of institutions and created interests for giving efficiency and certainty to the wrong,—in such a state of things, for a man to speak of supporting the law because it *is* the law, is like a negro's professing to support the whip because it *is* the whip. Make the sources of law-making honest and pure, and then there may be some claim for forbearance towards the defects of the law. But while the sources are avowedly dishonest and impure, and all manner of pains are seen taken to preserve them so, submitting in silence to injustice because it is the law, is a mere question of prudence in the sufferer. If he thinks he can do more good by braving the law, than will be balanced by the evil to himself, and feels disposed to make himself a sacrifice for the community, he is in the right to do it, and claim a martyr's honours whether on the great scale or on the small. It is the approved recipe, whether as applied by the martyrs under the bloody queen, by Hampden against ship-money, or John Thorogood against church-rates. To resist an unjust law, at some expense of personal safety or comfort, is the true way to collect forces for its removal; and he who proffers himself to bell the cat, is everywhere and always will be, the hero of popular admiration and support.

And next, that the complainants got their property subject to the rate; which is the crack argument a party leader in the House of Commons shall utter, and then turn round to his little boys behind and bid them cheer as if he had spoken oracles. Suppose then a certain per-centage, it matters not whether fifty, five, or one per cent., were taken from the properties of the landed aristocracy, for some purpose extremely hostile to their wishes and interests, or at all events to keep up some establishment of which they would have no enjoyment, and by which would be entailed on them the necessity of expending the same money over again for an establishment of their own. Of what use would it be to ask at some future time, whether the purchasers of land had not bought cheaper in consequence? It might be true of the purchasers; but where there was a first purchaser, was there not a seller? Put it to any man, put it to Sir Robert Peel himself, whether if there was injustice to begin with in taking this per-centage from the property of the land-owners and their representatives, it would be anything but babyism or intended fraud that should argue that the evil was null and void because there was a race of after purchasers who had not suffered. The Dissenters were wronged by an unjust impost, —one which the sect established under the title of the Estab-

lishment would talk of resisting to the death, if the question were of levying it under the name of Peter's pence upon themselves. The whole value of the Dissenters' property for ever, was diminished by the amount of the unjust impost; and the Dissenters are to hold their peace forsooth, because *some* property has since been bought by Dissenters at a reduced price as being subject to the impost. By the same rule, Dr. Southwood Smith might have his skin taken off, upon the plea, that if he ever purchased an anatomical subject without a skin, he would pay a reduced price accordingly. Pay the Doctor for his own skin; or what he will like still better, spare him the parting with it at all.

But there is more yet. Do no Dissenters *build* houses, and find the income from their brick and mortar diminished by precisely the value of the church-rate? Do none of them create establishments, manufacturing or other, and find the church-rate coming upon them in consequence, the owners all the time being under a virtual necessity of paying over again for the support of their own worship, in proportion to their rising means and standing in the world? Sift and turn it with all the art of all the little great men in the House of Commons, and it comes to nothing but this,—that you are to reckon all the cases where neither the Dissenter nor the churchman is touched by the consequences of church-rates at all, and you are to put out of sight all the cases in which the churchman gets something he likes for his money, and the Dissenter gets worse than nothing, to wit the contumely of being an enforced contributor to the expenses of a sect he does not approve, he all the while going to the further expense of supporting one of his own.

And now for the last, that the Church is the true Church. Every man would be the true man on the highway, and all the rest his payers and subsidizers, if society had not had the sense and power, by dint of gyves and gallows, to establish something like a rational composition upon the question. And the composition is briefly this, that the true man shall take what is his own, but shall not by virtue of his truth be allowed to take what is his neighbour's; to which may be added the further complication by way of corollary, that a majority of true men shall take a majority's share, but that no possible majority, of men possessed of ever so true truth, shall be entitled to take *the whole*, or all that there is for anybody. And here stands the church's quarrel. She says, I am true and I am a majority, therefore I will have *all*. And on the other side stands the community in general, waiting for a little more spread of

knowledge and a little more equalization of power, to reduce the rampant sect to something accordant with the common sense and practice of mankind.

But there is another point to fight. Not only has the oppressive sect no right to rob because she is the true; but she is *not* the true. That is to say, there are great holes in her claim to be what she declares herself, which give large room for rallying popular opposition to the insolence of her demands. Far be it from any sane man, to set himself up as a judge of what is abstractedly true. But there are certain limits of circumstances, within which all men of years of discretion claim a power of pronouncing upon truth or its contrary. And among these accidents, none is more decidedly operative, than the fact of a sect having risked the declaration that it is established upon a certain written rule. This was in fact the accident, which blew up the power of the church of Rome among our forefathers; men from an accumulation of causes bethought themselves of comparing with the rule, and then up went the church. And this rational procedure is of no limited application, and requires the concession of no step previous to its use. It may be exemplified wherever there is an acknowledged written rule; as for example, with the Korân. If there was no direction there, for instance, for abstaining from wine and observing certain fasts, then the authorities who insist on those things on the ground of their being in the written rule, would (with reservation always of the almost infinite allowance to be made for human weakness and the power of self-deception) be impostors and knaves. If anybody on the other side maintains that the "true believer" beyond the Danube is taught that women have no souls, and that his book contains indecencies and immoralities, the book being there to disprove it to all who have the ability to read, —the maintainer runs the risk of being rated as an ignorant blockhead, in exact proportion to his opportunity of knowing better. Modern liberals, in the plenitude of their liberality and in their scorn for the pretensions of their adversaries, are not in general aware what a dangerous step has been made by any sect or party, when it avows a written rule. It might be utterly in vain to try to carry any considerable masses to question the authority of the rule, even if you were prepared to deny it yourself. But it is the easiest thing in the world to lead people to examine the accordance of a sect with its own rule: particularly when that sect has made itself odious by insolence in all directions.

The established sect, then, builds a right to insult people

and take their money, on the boast that it is *true;* that is to say, that its forms, its dignities, and its constitution, are according to the written rule which is in the hands of all of us. The struggle is, in fact, for the divine right of Bishops; and the thesis advanced on our side is, that the word Bishop and all thereto pertaining, in its modern and actual construction is a fallacy, a fraud, or what an apostle would have expressed by a still less conciliatory form of speech;—a grand untruth got up and nursed by that corporate interest which never dies, and dandled from age to age into a maturity of hobgoblin. *Bishop*, as everybody may be supposed to know, is *Episcopus*, *Piscopus*, *Biscopus*, *Bishopus*, *Bishop;* and in all the languages in the world where the thing is known, the terms, however apparently different, may be traced to the same source. Now *episcopus*, as anybody who did not know before may know when he is told, is Greek for overseer; if you had shut up a Greek fasting till he had translated for you the words over-seer piecemeal, he could not have done it more literally; it is the preposition *epi* "over," and the verb *scopeo* "to see," or if preferred the noun *scopos* "seer." And this Greek word is of ordinary use in the New Testament. The question therefore is, whether it ever meant anything like a Bishop, and whether it did not mean something as opposite as well can be. If it decidedly meant the first, then the plea against us is good; if the other, then it is an ungentlemanly falsehood, to be resisted by any kind of martyrdom which gentlemen may like to have recourse to.

Which of these it is, must be settled as our ancestors did such things, by candid examination of the facts, founded on such book-learning as may be thereto required. And now then for my father's Concordance, which he very likely had by his side, when he was pelted with eggs new and old, for preaching what he thought right in his time, even as I do in mine.

The first place where the Greek word above given occurs, is in Acts xx. 28; and there it is translated, not bishops, but overseers. And for this good reason,—that the translator had before his eyes, that the persons spoken of were as like bishops, as corporals are to field-marshals. They were the elders *(presbyteri)* of the church of Ephesus. "And from Miletus "he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church. "And when they were come to him, he said unto them, Ye "know, &c. And now, behold, I know that ye all, among "whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see "my face no more. Wherefore I take you to record this day,

"that I am pure from the blood of all. For I have not shunned "to declare unto you all the counsel of God. Take heed there- "fore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the "Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of "God." It was plain that the great Apostle was not playing the part of an archbishop who had asked two or three bishops to dinner, but doing something much more like Napoleon when he called out the non-commissioned officers of a battalion, and harangued them in a few pithy words, as the most effective means of rapidly communicating with the rank and file. The thing was too palpable, and therefore we hear of no bishops there.

The next place is in the letter of the same Apostle to the Philippians; i. 1. "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of "Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at "Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons." The translator might as well have said "with the Lord Mayor and Aldermen," for there were just as many at Philippi. Indeed it is rather hard, that we have never heard of the divine right of aldermen; for it would be a very fair translation of the word which is rendered "elders." What these bishops at Philippi were, is clear enough. They were the same kind of men that came from Ephesus, the spiritual overseers, class-leaders it may be, of something (as Paley observes) very much like a Methodist society; while the *diaconi*, whose name is from the Greek word for dust, were individuals who having no gifts for spiritual leadership, made up for it by temporal services, such as holding the plate for contributions of the members, and perhaps sweeping out the meeting-house for love. At all events they were something as different as possible, from dapper young men with their pigtails thrust under their neck-cloths lest they should not pass, and declaring themselves moved by the spirit of God to take upon them the income of a family living, as has been the parallel joke to the joke of *bishops*.

The next place is in the first letter of the same Apostle to Timothy; iii. 1, 2. "This is a true saying, If a man desire the "office of a bishop, he desireth a good work." *Timothy* was at the head of the church at Ephesus, where the Apostle (i. 3.) had "besought him to abide;" this office therefore which men at Ephesus are represented as desiring, was not headship, but something they were more likely to get by wishing for; as unlike, in short, to all we understand by a bishopric, as John Thorogood may be to my Lord of Exeter. It was *a class-leadership* that was the object of these early Christians' ambi-

tion; and my Lord of Exeter would require to be purged of much unspiritual matter, before he was fined down to the simplicity of these old-world saints.

Read the directions that next follow, and see how much better they apply to a non-commissioned officer than to a bishop. "An overseer then [say corporal] must be blameless, the "husband of one wife [there is not a regiment in the service "in which it would not be an objection if he had two], vigilant, "sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality [meaning that "he would give a portion of his ration to a comrade that had "none], apt to teach [a good drill]; not given to wine [break "him directly if he is], no striker [must give up his stripes "if he does], not given to filthy lucre; but patient, not a "brawler, not covetous:" and so on. "Not a novice, [who "ever made a bishop of a novice?]; moreover he must have "a good report of them which are without. Likewise the "deacons [who were a sort of lance-corporals], grave, not "double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of "filthy lucre." Does not every man see, and in his conscience know, that these are directions for picking out a set of overseers or agents of a very humble class, and that all the rest is forgery or fraud?

The next is in the same Apostle's letter to Titus, his "own "son after the common faith," whom he had left in Crete, to "set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in "every city, as I had appointed thee: if any be blameless, the "husband of one wife [the same directions for chusing non-"commissioned officers], having faithful children, not accused "of riot or unruly. For [*a Bishop!* gramercy, they might as "well have said a Master of the Horse!] a man who is to be an "overseer of others, [meaning manifestly the elders aforesaid] "must be blameless, &c." Now is not this foul, is not this dishonest; is not it just the stuff to make Dissenters with, when it comes to be thrust down men's throats with Thorogood sauce? Not that it is to be laid to the charge of any individual man, who said to himself as in Solomon's days, "Let us go and be a very great rascal;" but it is an example of what comes by the corporate spirit in religious matters, where each in his turn contributes a little, to strengthen the Baal of the common idolatry.

The last instance is in the first letter of Peter, ii. 25; and presents as fine an example of the "pious fraud," as ever was pulled to pieces by the old Reformers at Paul's Cross. The writer is addressing "the strangers scattered throughout Asia," in language which Longinus or Mohammed, if they understood

the terms, would have recognized as appropriate and pathetic. He says to them, "For ye were as sheep going astray; but are "now returned unto the shepherd and guardian of your souls." And here some miserable creatures thought they could hitch in a bishop. They positively imagined the complimenting of Jesus of Nazareth, with raising him to the bench. The Spanish regiment which keeps a chair at the head of the mess-table for the Virgin Mary who is their colonel, is hardly a match for it. Whether all this is blasphemy or not, those skilled in such matters best know. But whether it is bathos or not, is within any ordinary man's apprehension.

But there is one place more, (Acts i. 25.), where not the word bishop but one of its connected terms, is foisted in under circumstances which might have moved a smile from the gravest of the Apostles who knew the man. A passage in the Psalms is applied to Judas Iscariot, where it is said "and his office let another take." Now Judas's office was to bear the bag. And this they have mistaken for a bishopric.

Is a church whose claims rest on such ridiculous forgeries on the written rule it professes to depend on, to be indulged by plain men in bullying them upon the ground of its being *the true* church, any more than any other of its pretexts for injustice? The time seems to be favourable for setting up a new Protestantism, or a new sect of some kind. Why will men who live in glass houses, insist on putting John Thorogood within stone walls?

London, 19 *August*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXIII.

THE CHURCH FURTHER TRIED BY ITS OWN RULE.—SABBATICAL OBSERVANCE.—THE TYRANNY OF THE CHURCH EXPOSED.—RESISTANCE OF THE EARLY PROTESTANTS.—CONFESSION OF AUGSBURG.

SIR,—According to engagement, I proceed to a subject on which I have been honoured at all events with some abuse, if not with persecution; and you will perhaps be of opinion, that a part of the positions of last week are not without their bearing on the matter of the present.

One of the positions there supported, must be insisted on to the letter. And that is, that when once a sect or priesthood have acknowledged a written rule, they become amenable to comparison therewith, and will be brought to the test accord-

ingly, the moment they give sufficient umbrage to men's substantial interests to lead them to the exertion. The church of Rome (without offence be it said to adherents now happily constituting a part of the great array for religious liberty), made a rather extensive experiment in this direction, by endeavouring to check the familiarity of the laity with the written rule, except under the supervision of the clergy. And the consequence was, a great convulsion when from various causes the knowledge of the rule made head in defiance of control.

The domineering sect in England then, (to which may be added the whole or portions of sundry other sects nothing loth to profit by a scheme of religious imposition which suits their interests), profess to be guided by the written rule contained in the acknowledged versions of the Old and New Testament. The rule is not the simplest; but the parties agree pretty well in their statement of the general result. They admit that the most early portion of the rule contained a multitude of ordinances, which they say are abrogated now, in consequence of the declarations, partly of Christ, but still more of his apostles, to that effect. In fact they would be at some loss to establish the abrogation at all, except upon the authority of these last; for nothing is clearer than that the founder of the Christian religion lived in a general submission to the law under which he was born, and though he claimed powers and laid down principles strongly tending to the final abrogation of its authority, never engaged either himself or followers in any active refusal to submit to its rites. To speak plainly, the apostle Paul,—that inoculation of earthly talent among branches not otherwise distinguished for temporal qualities,—is the source (the channel, if the church prefers it) to which we owe our freedom at this day from the most onerous of Jewish rites. There is no doubt about the matter; if the Jew of Tarsus had not "withstood" his brother of the keys "to the face, because he was to be blamed" (Galat. ii. 11.), we should have been circumcised by warrant from Canterbury at this hour, and a sore thing it would have been.

Canterbury then acknowledges, that we are not circumcised because the apostle Paul forbade it. Did he forbid anything else? If he did, does Canterbury maintain that he had the power of forbidding circumcision, but not of forbidding that other thing? It would appear that Canterbury does not.

Now then "to the law and to the testimony," as our fathers did. "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think" ye have

27576

the rule by which Canterbury is controlled. The Cantian sect allows in general terms, the abrogation of the Jewish law on the authority of the apostle; but it excepts one twig, and applies it in every way hurtful to our corporal feelings which it can devise; deprives the working classes of their day of improvement and solace, shuts up our gardens and the wild beasts that are therein, stops our post, closes our railroads, would keep our ships in harbour and hinder us from having our beards shaved if it could, desires us to eat cold meat, anathematizes bakehouses, inflicts stale bread for which the bakers work on the holyday and rest the night before, defines the hours when beef-steaks and ale may be consumed, pulls the fruits of the earth out of the mouths of little boys who would munch them three for a penny, capsizes apple-stalls, exorcises lollipops as if a devil were in each, pretends to level "the vengeance of Almighty God" out of its little pop-gun against ginger-beer and soda-water, impugns the carcases of factory children who after having been shut up for six days essay to catch a stickleback upon the seventh, scowls at the tenants of the smoky town who dare to quit it for unholy Gravesend consuming ham and porter by the way, watches for their blowing-up and keeps the type ready set for accidents "on Sunday last," counts the boats that go through London Bridge with the eye of him that looks over Lincoln from the Cathedral's tower, and in a hundred ways plays more fantastic tricks than the Roman pontiff ever dreamed of in the palmiest days of his interference with the Friday's roasts or Saturday's boiled meats of our ancestors. And all this on the pretext, that the sabbath is not in the Apostle's list, or that its burthens are by some hocus-pocus transferred to another day of the week.

And now to see whether the Apostle has left any flaws in his work or not. He is writing to "the brethren at Colosse," converts "among the Gentiles" (i. 27.), for whom he expresses great anxiety, "has great conflict," that they may be brought to "the full assurance of understanding" of "the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" which are "in Christ." And it looks out immediately, that he has a controversy in his eye. There is something about which his converts are in danger of being "beguiled with enticing words;"—a single English term can hardly fail to present itself on view of the Greek, if its being more forcible than elegant did not preclude its use. They are to "beware lest any man spoil them through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." All this is not

very direct; but he digresses *more Paulino*, and then the matter comes out. It is *circumcision* and the other Jewish rites, that he is aiming at. He tells them they are circumcised "with the circumcision made without hands;" a most comfortable doctrine doubtless to his hearers, and from which they manifestly were to understand, that they were to set all circumcisers at defiance. And not circumcision only, but Jewish ordinances in general; and they are encouraged to make no secret of the matter, but to view their recusancy as a thing to be openly put forward, and triumphantly thrust into the faces of their opponents. For they are told that Christ had "quickened" them in their state of uncircumcison, "blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against them, which was contrary to them, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it."

In this there may be traits of the enthusiastic eloquence mingled with a kind of wild poetry, which caused the Palmyrene prime minister to place the Christian apostle in his list of orators. But there is also in it a plain prose direction as ever was issued by adjutant in orderly-book, and which the converts would not fail most feelingly to mark, learn, and inwardly digest, authorizing and commanding them to scout, resist, and set at the most triumphant defiance, all attempts upon their personalities and other comforts, founded on the abrogated ordinances of the Jewish law.

But perhaps the case required a little more particularity. Statutes are to be construed strictly; and a prohibition of circumcision might not amount to an abrogation of things not enumerated. Might pork be eaten; was the example of Samson and the Rechabites on the question of wine, if not compulsory, at least matter of merit; was it needful to keep the passover, to blow up the trumpet in the new moon, and most important of all as of most continual recurrence, to observe the restrictions of the seventh day or sabbath? The apostle would not have been half an apostle, if on all and each of these heads he had not categorically told the Colossians his mind. Give time for another verse, and see what comes.

Μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω ἐν βρώσει ἢ ἐν πόσει, ἢ ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς ἢ νουμηνίας ἢ σαββάτων.

"Let not therefore anybody judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of feast or new moon or sabbaths."

Feast in the Greek, is the term applied everywhere in the New Testament to the Jewish festivals, particularly the

Passover; and "holyday" must have been the translation of somebody who was thinking more of his own times than the apostle's. The introduction of "the" before "new moon" and in the next instance, as done in the official version, is an indefensible interpolation; why cannot a translator as well give what there is in his original as what there is not? In Latin, the matter would have been doubtful; but in Greek, it is as palpable as in the English.

But the apostle has no intention of stopping here. He does not mean his converts to think these are things they may let alone or not as they like. He waxes fervently prohibitory; and breaks out as follows,—always being borne in mind, that the keeping of this sabbath we are tormented about, is one of the things he is fulminating against.

"Which [*sabbaths* was the last word] are a shadow of "things to come; but the body is of Christ. Let no man be- "guile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and wor- "shipping of angels [the very points which Canterbury pro- "fesses to quarrel with the Church of Rome about, on the "strength of this very passage], intruding into those things "which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly "mind, and not holding the Head, from which all the body "by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and "knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. Where- "fore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, "why, as though living in the world, ARE YE SUBJECT TO ORDI- "NANCES, (TOUCH NOT; TASTE NOT; HANDLE NOT; which are "all to perish with the using;) after the commandments and "doctrines of men? Which things have indeed a show of "wisdom in will worship, and humility, and neglecting of the "body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh."

Why then, when the sabbath is so manifestly in the Apostle's list of "enumerated goods," does he of Canterbury insist on levying the old scale of duties? Hear to the reasons, why as the Quakers are accused of saying, "friend Paul was mistaken." In the first place, the order for the Jewish sabbath is in a particular chapter of Exodus, the twentieth. Paul did not know this; but Canterbury knows in defiance of Paul, that everything which was commanded to Jews in the twentieth of Exodus, was commanded to all who should not be Jews, from thenceforth for ever. Yet the same chapter contains a prohibition of the arts of sculpture and design, of the making "any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth;" and the most populous religion in the world, if not

actually the major part of the human race, at this moment considers all such arts unlawful, by adoption of this command. But Canterbury does not. Why does he not? He says the object of the command was clear;—to prevent the danger of idolatry. And, ceasing the necessity, he thinks the precept may cease. Paul said the same of the sabbath eighteen centuries ago. But Canterbury holds out, because the sabbath is in the same chapter with the "graven images."

There was not only to be a sabbatical day, but a sabbatical year, and a sabbath of sabbatical years, or fiftieth year of jubilee. But of all these we hear nothing now; the apostle, it must be supposed, was competent to abrogate. The day of atonement (Lev. xvi. 31.) was to be "a sabbath of rest unto you, and ye shall afflict your souls, *by a statute for ever*;" it was to be "*an everlasting statute* unto you," (34.). The fiftieth day after the sabbath of first fruits, was to "be an holy convocation unto you: ye shall do no servile work therein: it shall be *a statute for ever* in all your dwellings throughout your generations," (Lev. xxiii. 21.). On the tenth day of the seventh month, and on the fifteenth and twenty-second of the same, "ye shall do no servile work therein," and "it shall be a *statute for ever* in your generations," (27. 35. 36. 41.). Yet we hear nothing of these "statutes for ever;" with respect to them, the apostle is supposed to have been right. Circumcision was established with Abraham (Gen. xvii. 7.) for "*an everlasting covenant*;" yet the Archbishop of Canterbury is not circumcised. Where an apostle abrogates, there he will not abrogate. Where the ancient testament expressly declares that a statute was "for ever," there he will abrogate if it suits him, on the authority of the apostle.

Secondly, it is urged that the sabbath is called "the holy of the Lord, honourable;" therefore the apostle was wrong when he put it in the list of abrogations. But if circumcision is not declared to be the same, the want of it is at all events sufficiently stigmatized as unholy and dishonourable; "dog" was a civil term in comparison with "uncircumcised one." Yet circumcision quietly goes out of use, because no church sees an interest in keeping it up in opposition to the apostle.

Thirdly, it is urged that the early Christians had certain observances on the first day of the week; which, it may be gathered from the circumstance of its being once mentioned under the title of "the Lord's day," was selected as being the day of the resurrection of their Lord. On which subject the points established are three and no more, as extracted from the only places where it is alluded to at all. Paul preached

at Troas "upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread" (Acts xx. 7.); from which it may fairly be inferred that the early Christians were in the habit of meeting for religious purposes, probably the celebration of the Eucharist, upon that day. In confirmation of which, they are further found directed to make collections for charitable or other purposes on that day (1 Cor. xvi. 2.). And finally, an apostle (Rev. i. 10.) is stated to have been "in the Spirit on the Lord's day." These are positively the only ways in which the subject is ever mentioned; and on these grounds it is that we are told we must shut up our Zoological Gardens, our Museums, and our railroads.

Now is there a child knowing these facts, who will not burn with indignation at the miserable fraud and clerical imposture which has been put upon him, when his innocence was taught that this sabbatical plague and misery was inculcated by the Christian religion; the truth being all the time, that it was as rigidly forbidden, as angel-worship, or any other of the corruptions which his forefathers so gallantly threw off?

And not to stand on private judgment in this matter, see what was the formal decision of the fathers of Protestantism, whose authority would be dinned into our ears as next to divine, if it had happened to be against us. And because it is not good to draw a conclusion from insulated passages, here will be found added the whole Chapter OF THE POWER OF THE CHURCHE and thence to the end, of the Confession of Augsburg in 1530, as rendered in THE CONFESSYON OF THE FAYTHE OF THE GARMAYNES EXIBITED TO THE MOUSTE VICTORIOUS EMPEROUR CHARLES THE V. IN THE COUNCELL OR ASSEMBLE HOLDEN AT AUGUSTA, THE YERE OF OUR LORDE 1530*. To which is added the original Latin of such of the paragraphs as bear more immediately on the subject in hand. From these will be collected the tone and general spirit in which the early Confessors of Protestantism took up the question; and it will be seen how resolutely they stand on the authority of the Apostle, and unceremoniously class the "kepynge of the Sondaye" among the Jewish traditions the enforcement of which upon Christians the scripture calls "doctrynes of deuyls," maintaining that the very reason why the early Christians transferred their assemblies from the seventh day of the week to the first, was "that men myght haue an example of Chrys-" ten libertie, and myght knowe that the keepynge and the " obseruation neyther of the saturday nor of any other day is

* See page 110 next following.

"necessary." Melancthon too in his "Apology" or defence attached to the "Confession," repeatedly quotes the same passage of the Apostle, as enumerating the rites by which Christians are forbidden to be constrained.

I have preferred preserving the obsolete English of the time of Henry VIII, because it obviates the suspicion of purposed mistranslation, and because there is an interest in thinking that the identical copy used may have been worn by the hands of the men who in a succeeding reign gave their bodies to be burned upon this very quarrel. Why are we to shrink, where our forefathers faced fire and faggot in resistance to ecclesiastical oppression? There were just as many pleas then as now; just as much outcry of "infidels" and what not, against any that dared oppose a domineering church; as many appeals to prudence, and the good rather than harm arising from allowing the priest to interfere in all the businesses of common life. Our fathers uttered one bold word—"It's *false*. It is against your own rule; and therefore we "will not submit." And as our fathers, so do we.

What a turmoil, what a splutter, was in this land, when it was first announced that the numerous classes were declaring they would not eat fish, they would not bow down, they would not confess but when they liked, and this because the secret had got wind that these things were either not in the priests' own rule, or were against it! What threats of hell flames, what splashing about of fire and brimstone, what registration of judgments on men choked with a beef-steak on Friday! Look at one of those simple men in the present day, who shock themselves with the barouches, the cigars, the newspapers, and the elephants, of a London Sunday, and occasionally digress to Paris, for the keener excitation of seeing Punch upon the Boulevards, and wondering where heaven reserves its thunder. And put the parallel case, that a good Austrian or Navarrese catholic came here, and grieved his heart with our weekly doings on a Friday, to say nothing of our more wholesale offences for forty days together in Lent. "Such fry-"ing! Such barbecuing! In no place did I see anybody having "the smallest notion of a red herring. All are involved in "one flood of sin and gravy. How fathomless the patience "of heaven, that such an island is not swallowed up of the "deep!" Is there no convincing such a man, that the simple cause of our resistance to his law, is that *we do not believe it?* We have looked into the rule he professes to go by; and we declare it is not there, but the contrary. We know we must appear in the next world with all our mutton on our heads.

But we have done our best to look at the rule with the light that God has given us; and in spite of Austria or Navarre, we will take the risk of His not being angry with us, for seeing no prohibition of mutton there.

But *why* the dominant sect should attach such importance to a direct departure from the rock whence it professes to have been hewn, is, all levity apart, a weighty and a serious consideration. And the visible reason is this. It dreads the effects which would ensue, from giving the numerous classes one day of rest from labour in seven, unhampered by the regulations of the priest. It fears the consequences of freely permitting them to apply one day to the attainment of the knowledge, which the necessity of earning their daily bread precludes them from pursuing on the other six. And therefore it closes libraries, shuts up museums and works of art, prohibits lectures, opposes public instruction in the guise of newspapers, discourages railroads and other means of personal intercommunication, stigmatizes social meetings, and in every other way does the office of an extinguisher upon the uses of the people's day, except as may subserve its own dull purpose of "instilling barren souls with conscientious slavery."

As the establishment of early Protestantism was the signal, through many struggles, for a vast accession of civil liberty and happiness, so it seems highly probable that an assault on the encroachments of the recreant sect which wants to establish a new papacy at Canterbury, would be the inlet to a great enlargement of popular securities and rights. All classes of men are among the injured. If free and speedy intercommunication by letter be a national good, the commercial and public man, the anxious parent, the home-staying wife, the physician that could heal and the patient who might be relieved, are shut out by a priestly fraud from the knowledge of what is in the world, for fourteen per cent. of the days of their lives. The writer of this, though none of these more markedly than his neighbours, has suffered to the value of many thousand pounds by the sacerdotal obstruction on the post alone, and would readily submit to the most onerous of Jewish rites, if it would place him in the *status quo*. But it is on the working classes that the evil falls with intolerable weight. They are robbed of the day, which bound as they are on other days to ceaseless toil, is their all, the sole of time allowed them whereby to differ from a steam-engine or a mill-horse.

There will be no good done till the working classes set up the cry of "Huzza for St. Paul and the Confession of Augsburg; "and no Thomas of Canterbury!" Whenever they dare set

themselves in opposition to superstitious and antichristian prejudices as their fathers did, there will be no difficulty in making a reasonable settlement with conflicting claims for rest. Sailors like well to sleep in the middle watch; but they do not therefore insist on being all asleep at once. Get rid of the antichristian prejudice, and there would be little difficulty in legislative regulation which should ensure to every man his day of rest, without the malicious ingenuity of demanding all to rest on one day as priestcraft would suggest; and so give full scope for the employment without injury, of as many as should be essential to the comforts of the festival of the majority.

Public men have certainly not taken up this question by the right end. Some of them are understood to profess small reverence for the rule; but that is no reason why they should let go the long end of the lever, consisting in the power of examining how far the demands of an encroaching sect agree with its own rule, where the case has become one of civil oppression and public suffering. As an instance, there is no difficulty in entering into the question between the Wahabees (who are a kind of Mohammedan Lutherans) and the dominant sect; it is within every man's compass to form a pretty good judgment, whether a command or a prohibition is in the Korân or not.

Finally, I must take the opportunity to defend myself from the charge of having entered on this question needlessly, or conducted it with a disregard for public prejudice whether right or wrong. It was forced on me, first by accident, and afterwards by ill treatment and consequent inquiry, as is the usual round. A few years ago, and I verily thought I did God service, by flying in the face of an apostle to please an archbishop. While I sat for Hull, a deputation was sent to urge me to oppose in committee the closing of their railroad. Perhaps you think they were my own particulars, sent by some understanding with myself. They were not; they were the then or lately Conservative town-clerk, and the since Conservative member for the East Riding. And they stood over me while I did my work. So I said, which was quite true, that when I was going out governor to Sierra Leone in 1808, Mr. Wilberforce told me he did not believe Sunday was of divine ordinance, but he thought it was an excellent political institution. Some of the bigots thinking to frighten me, brought it up afterwards in the House. But they caught a Tartar; for I only told it again. After this, came abuse of various kinds; and it is only the other day you saw my Manchester

libeller, if we may judge from his printed hand, calling me infidel, by which he means dog. But as has happened in other cases, it all drove me to looking into the matter more closely. So once more "Huzza for St. Paul and the Confession of Augsburg!" and if the dominant sect will not hear reason, we will make them when we are strong enough, as our fathers did before us.

London, 23 *August*, 1840.

OF THE POWER OF THE CHURCHE.

(*From the Confession of Augsburg*, *A.D.* 1530.)

Great dysputations haue ben of the power of byshoppes, in whyche many men haue confusely mengled togyther the power of the churche, and the power of the swerde [sword]. Of this confusion great battaylles, great unquietnes haue proceded, whyles byshoppes bearynge them selfes bolde upon the power of the keys, not allonely haue instytute and begonne new honours of god, and not onely haue burdoned consciences, with reservation of cases [casuistry], and with violent excommunications and cursynges, but also haue translated and remoued the kyngdomes of the worlde, and gone aboute to take awaye thempire [the empire] from themperours; well disposed and learned men haue reproued these vises [vices] in the churche longe sythen. Therfore our preachers to thentent [the intent] to conforte consciences: were constrayned to shewe the difference of the ecclesiastical power, and of the power of the swerde, and haue taught that eyther of them because of goddes commaundement is to be had in greate reuerence and honour, as hygh benefytes of god upon earthe.

And thus oure lerned men thynke, this is theyr opinion, that the power of the keys, or the power of the byshoppes accordynge to the gospell, is a power or a commaundement of god to preache the gospell, to remytte, and retayne, lose, and bynde synnes, and to mynystre Sacramentes. For. with that commaundement Chryste sendeth forth his apostles, sayenge as my father hath sent me, even so I sende you. Take the holy ghoste, whose synnes ye remytte they be remytted, and whose synnes ye holde styll they be holden styll. Also in the gospell of Marke he saythe: Go preache the gospell to euery creature. &c.

This power is put in execucion onely by teachynge or preachynge the gospell, and by mynystryng the Sacramentes eyther to a multitude, or elles to one man by him selfe accordyng to his vocation and callynge, for here be graunted not corporall thynges, but eternall thinges, as eternall ryghtuousnes, the holy ghoste eternall lyfe. These thynges can not chaunce or come but by ministracion of the worde and of the sacramentes. As Paule saythe: The gospell is the power of God to saluation to all that beleue therfore syth the power of the churche graunteth eternal

thynges and is exercised onely by ministration of the word; it lettith [hindereth] not ciuile [civil] administracion. lyke as the crafte of synging nothing lettith ciuile or political administration, for political administration goth [goeth] aboute other thinges then [than] doth the gospell. For the gouernour or ruler defendeth not myndes, but bodies and bodely thynges agaynste manyfeste iniuries, and restreyneth men with the swerde and corporall paynes to thentent [the intent] to kepe cyuyle [civil] iustice and peace.

Therfore the power of the churche and the ciuile power may not be myxed and confounded together. The power of the churche hathe his commaundemente to teache the gospell and to mynistre the sacramentes. Let it not breke into anothers offyce, let it not translate and altere the kyngdomes of the world as the bishops of Rome haue done, let it not abrogate and defete lawes of prynces, let it not take awaye due and lawfull obeuience of the subiecte to his prynce, let it not interrupte iudgementes of any cyuile ordinaunces or contractes, let it not prescribe ne appoynt lawes to gouernours of the fourme and facion of the comen welthe, as Chryste saythe: My kyngdome is not of this worlde. Also in an other place he sayth: *Quis me constituit judicem aut divisorem super vos.* That is to saye, who made me judge or deuider ouer you. And Paule saith to the Philippians: Our policye or conuersation is in heuen [heaven]. And to the Corinthes: The armure or wepons of oure cheualry [chivalry] be not carnall, but mighty through god to destroy cogitacions, and thoughtes. &c. After this sorte do our men dyuyde [divide] the offices and dueties of bothe these powers, and teache to honour them bothe, and to acknowlege that eche of them is a gyft and benefyte of god.

If bishops haue any power of the swerde, that power haue they not as byshoppes by the commaundement of the gospell, but by mannes lawe gyuen [given] to them of kynges, and emperours, to the cyuile ministration of theyr owne goodes. So that this is another offyce than is the mynistration of the gospel.

Therfore when soever question is made of the iurisdiction of byshops, the empyre, and temporall power ought to be deuided [divided], and distincted from the ecclesiasticall iurisdiction. Undoubtedly after the gospell, and after goddes lawe no iurisdiction belongeth to byshoppes (that is to say) to them to whome is committed the mynystration of the worde and of the sacramentes, saue onely this power to remitte and lose [loose] sinnes, and also to discerne and judge doctrines, and to reiecte a doctrine contrary to the gospell, and to exclude and shyt [shut] oute from the communion of the church, wycked men, whose wickedness is knowen, and this muste be with the worde, without mannes violence. In these things the congregations, or churches owe of dutie, and be by the lawe of god bounden to submitte them selues and to shewe obedience, accordyng to that saieing of Chryste: Who [*here seem to be missed the words* heareth you,] heareth me.

But when they teach or ordeyne any thynge agaynst the gospell, then the congregations haue a commaundement of god prohibitynge obedyence. As this: Beware of false prophetes, and Paule to the Galathians: If an

aungell from heuen wolde preache or shew any other gospel, accursed be he' Also to the Corinthes: We can nothynge do agaynst the truthe, but [*here seems to be missed* for] the truthe. Also in another place he sayeth: Power is gyuen to us for edification and not for destruction. So also do the canon lawes comaundo 2 D. 7. *cap. Sacerdotes, et cap.* 'Oves. And S. Austine agaynst the epistle of Petilian sayeth: If catholique byshoppes be deceyued [deceived] any where by chaunce, and thynke any thing agaynst the canonicall scryptures of god, we ought not to consent to them.

If byshops haue any other power or iurisdicion as in cognisaunce of plee [plea] or in determinyng of certayne causes, as of matrimony or of tythes: they haue it by mans lawe, wherin when the ordinaries fayle to do theyr dueties, because eyther they wyl not, or can not, prynces be compelled (yea whether they wylle or not) to see the lawe ministred to theyr subiectes for peace to be had amongest them.

Moreouer, it is disputed whether byshops, or pastours haue ryght and auctorite to ordeyne ceremonies in the churche and to make lawes of meates, of holy dayes, and degrees of ministers or orders, &c. They that ymagin [imagine] this auctorite to be in byshops, alledge and bryng for them this testimonie and auctoritie of scrypture. Yet I haue many thynges to saye to you, but ye can not yet beare them, but when that spyryte of verytye shall come, he shall teache you all truthe. They alledge also the example of the apostels whiche made a prohibition that the people shulde absteyne from bloude and suffocate. They alledge the Sabbat daye chaunged into Sundaye contrary to the boke of the x commaundementes called the Decalogie as it semeth. Neyther is there any example more craked upon and bosted [cracked upon and boasted] then is the chaunging of the Sabbat day. Greate, say they, is the power and auctorytie of the churche, sythe [since] it dispensed with one of the x commaundementes.

But as touchyng this question our men teache after this sorte, that byshops haue no power to decre and ordeyne any thyng agaynst the gospell, as it is shewed before. The canone lawes teach the same thyng. 9. *Distinc.* But it is agaynst scrypture to make traditions, or to exacte or require them to be obserued, for thentent [the intent] that by that obseruation we may get pardon of sinnes, and may satisfye and make amendes for synnes. For thus the glory of the meryte of christe is hurte and minished, whan we go aboute to deserue remission of synnes and iustyfycatyon with such obseruations. Nowe it is openly knowen that tradicions haue growen almoste to an infinite nombre in the churche, by the meanes of that persuasion, and the doctryne of fayth and ryghtuousnes of fayth in the meane whyle hath been oppressed. For styll more holy dayes and more were made, and fastyngdayes were commaunded, newe ceremonies, new honourynges of sayntes were institute. For the deuisers and auctors of such thynges thought to gette remyssyon of synnes and iustification with these workes. So grewe uppe the penitential canones in tymes passed, of which yet we see certayne tokenes and steppes in satisfactions [penances].

Also many wryters there be, which fayne [feign] that in the newe testament there muste be an honourynge of god, lyke as that whiche we

reade in Leuiticus, the orderyng whereof God commytted to the apostles and byshoppes. And these wryters seme to be deceyved with thexample of Moyses lawe, as thoughe the ryghtuousnes of the newe testament were an outward obseruation of certayne rytes and ceremonies, lyke as the iustice of the olde lawe was an outwarde obseruation of certayne rytes. Wherfore lyke as in the olde lawe it was synne to eate swynes flesh &c. so in the newe testament they putte syn in meates, in dayes, in vesture, and semblable thinges. And they thynke that the ryghtuousnes of the newe testament can not be without these thinges. Of this occasion came those burdens, that certayne meates do defyle and pollute the conscience, and that it is deadly synne to omytte and leaue unsayde canonicall houres [services so called], that fastynges deserue remyssyon of synnes, and that they be necessaryé to the ryghtuousnes of the newe testament, that synne in a case reserued can not be forgyuen [forgiven] without thauctoryte [the authority] of the reseruer, where as in very dede the canones them selues speake onely of the reseruation of the canonycall payne [punishment] and not of the reseruation of synne.

From whens [whence] I pray you, and of whome haue the byshops theyr power and aucthoritie to laye these traditions upon the churche to vexe or greue [grieve] theyr consciences. For euery man may se [see] open auctoryties and clere testimonies whiche prohibite the makyng of suche traditions eyther to deserue remyssion of synnes, or as necessarye to the ryghtuousnes of the newe testament or to saluation

For Paule to the Collossenses saythe: Lette no man iudge you in meate, drynke, parte of the holy daye &c. Also: Yff ye be deade with Chryste from the elementes of the world, why as lyving in the world do ye kepe decrees, touch not, taste not, &c. which be commaundementes and doctrynes of men, and haue a pretence and a colour of wysedome. Also to Tyte he prohibiteth traditions apertlye [openly], warnynge that they be not attendynge to the Judaicall tales and to commaundementes of men, whiche turne from the truthe. And Chryste speakynge of them that require tradytyons sayeth in this wyse: Let them alone, they are blynde guydes of the blinde, and he reproueth such honours [reverential observances] sayenge: All plantes, whiche, the father of heuen dyd not plante, shalbe [shall be] plucked up by the rootes.

If byshops haue auctoritie to onerate and lade churches with infynite traditions and to snare the consciences, why doth scrypture so often prohibete to make and to heare traditions? Why dothe it call them doctrynes of deuyls [devils]? Dyd the holy ghost warne those thynges before in vayne? Wherfore it muste nedes consequently ensue, that syth ordenaunces instituted as thynges necessary, or with an opinion to deserue remission of synne, be contrary to the gospell: that it is not lawfull for any byshop to institute or require such honours [observances]. For it is necessary that the doctryne of Chrysten [Christian] libertie be kepte styll in the churches, whiche is that the bondage of the lawe is not necessary to iustification, as it is wryten in the epistle to the Galathians: Be not subiecte agayne to the yoke of bondage. The chyef place of the gospell muste nedes be kepte styll, whiche is, that we

optayne remission of synnes, and iustification freely by fayth in Chryste, and not for certayne obseruations or honours deuysed by men.

What shal we thynke than of the Sonday and lyke rytes of the temples? To this our lerned men saye, that it is lawfull to byshops or to pastors to make ordynaunces, that thinges be ordrelye done in the Churche not that we shulde purchase by them remyssion of sines, or that we can satisfie for sinnes, or that consciences be bounde to iudge them necessary honours, or to thynke that they sinne, whan without offence of other they breake them. So Paule doth ordeyne that in the congregation that women shulde couer theyr heeddes, and that interpreters and teachers be herde after an ordre in the Churche.

It is conuenient that the Churches shulde kepe suche ordinaunses for charitie and tranquilite so farre forth that one offendeth not another that all thynges be done in the churches in ordre, and without busynes and trouble, but yet so that the conscience be not charged, as to thynke that they be necessary to saluacion, or to judge that they synne whan they breake them without hurtynge of others. As no man wyll saye that a woman doth synne which gothe forthe abrode bare heded offendynge nobody ther with.

Euen suche is the obseruation and kepyng of the Sonday, of Easter, of Pentheeoste, and lyke holydayes and rytes. For they that judge that by the auctorite of the churche the obseruynge of the Sondaye in stede of the Sabbat day was ordeyned as a thyng necessary do greatly erre. The scrypture permitteth and graunteth that the kepynge of the Sabbat daye is nowe free, for it teacheth that the ceremonies of Moyses lawe after the reuelation and shewynge abrode of the gospell are not necessarye. And yet because it was nedefull to ordeyne a certayne daye, that the people myght know whan they ought to come together it appereth that the Church dyd apoynt the Sonday, whiche daye (as it semeth) pleased them rather than the Sabbat daye, euen for this cause, that men myght haue an example of Chrysten libertie, and myght knowe that the kepynge and the observation neyther of the saturday nor of any other day is necessary.

Prodygyous, monstruous, and wonderful disputations are set forth of the chaungynge of the lawe, of the ceremonies of the newe lawe, of the chaungyng of the Sabbat day, which all haue sprunge forth of a false persuation and beleue of men, whiche thought that there muste nedes be in the churche an honouryng of God, lyke to the leuiticall, and that Chryst commytted, to the apostles and to byshops auctorytie to inuent and to fynde out ceremonies, whiche be necessary to saluation. These errours crepte in to the church whan the ryghtuousnes of faythe was not clearely ynough taught. Some dyspute that the kepynge of the Sondaye is not merely and fully goddes lawe, but in a maner, as it were of the law of god. [The literal translation would accord with modern use; "is not of divine right, but of *quasi* divine right."] They prescrybe of holy dayes, howe far forth it is lawfull to worke. Suche maner of disputations, what other thynges be they but snares of consciences. For all though they busy them selues to modefye, qualifie, and fynde an epikee in theyr tradycions, [For however they may try to make out

their traditions to be ἐπιεικείας, *epieikeias*, "conventional proprieties,"—in allusion to a preceding place where the Greek word is introduced as employed by the opponents,] temperynge the rygour of them with fauourable declarations, yet notwithstandynge as longe as the opinion that they are necessary doth remayne (whiche must nedes remayne where ryghtuousness of faythe, and Chrysten libertie are not knowen) this epikee equitye [conventional próprietý] and fauour can neuer be perceyued ne knowen.

The apostles commaunded to absteyne from bloudde: who dothe nowe obserue and kepe it? And yet they that do not kepe it, sine [sin] not, for undoubtedly not the apostles them selues wolde burden the conscience with suche bondage, but they prohibited it for a tyme, for avoydynge of sclaunder. For the perpetuall wyll and mynde of the gospell is to be consydered in a decree. Scase [scarce] any canones are kepte dyligentlye, and many daylye go out of use and memorye, yea with them which defende traditions moste dyligently. Neyther can the consciences be holpen ne provyded for, oneless this epikee or equitie [conventional rule] be kepte, that is to witte, that we knowe that canones and decrees are to be kepte without opinion of necessitie, and that consciences are not hurte though traditions be forgotten and utterly set asyde.

Certes byshops might easely kepe styll lawefull obedience, yf they wolde not inforce men to kepe tradytyons, whiche can not be kepte with good conscience. They commaunde prestes [priests] to liue [liye] unmaryed, they receyve none, oneles they sweare in effecte that they wyl not teach the pure doctryne of the gospell. The congregations require not that the byshops shulde repare and make concord agayne with losse and decay of theyr honour, and yet it shulde become good pastours so to do, but they onely requyre, that they wolde release, and pardone [forego] unjuste burdones which are newe, and receyved contrary to the custome of the catholyke churche. We will not denie but in the begynnynge some constitucions were grounded upon reasonable and probable causes. Which yet are not now agreable ne conuenyent for the tymes ensuing. It appereth also that some were by errour receyued. Wherfore it myght apperteyne to the gentlenes of byshoppes, nowe to mitigate and release them, sythe suche mutation breaketh not the unite of the churche. For many mannes traditions in processe of tyme haue been chaunged, as the canones them selues do shewe. That yf it can not be opteyned, that those obseruations shulde be released, which can not be done without synne: we muste nedes folowe the rule of the apostles, which commaunde rather to obeye god then men. Peter forbyddeth byshops to be Lordes, and emperours ouer the churche. Nowe it is not entended by us to take awaye iurisdiction from the byshoppes, but this one thyng is required of them, that they wolde suffre the gospell to be purely taught, and that they wolde release a fewe certayne obseruations, whiche can not be obserued without synne. That yf they wyl not remytte ne release any thing, let them loke to theyr charge how they shall make accomptes to God in that they were occasion of this scisme and diuision, by reason of theyr obstinacie and styffenes.

THE CONCLUSION OF THE BOKE.

These be the chiefest articles, whiche seme to be in controuersie, and debate. For all though of moo [more] abuses it myght haue ben spoken: yet because we wolde not be tedious ne longe, we medled but with the moste pryncypall of whiche the rest may easely be judged. Great complayntes there were of pardons, of pylgrymages, of the abuse of excommunication, parochies [parishes] were many wayes vexed by [on the subject of] stationaries [by disputes about residence. Every one installed to the privileges and profits of residence, is *residentiarius;* and while he actually keeps such stated residence, he is *stagiarius* or *stationarius*]. Infinyte contentions and stryfes there were betwyxt curates [the secular clergy], and relygious men [the regular or monks], for the ryght of the paryshe, for confessions, for burialles, for extraordinarie preachynges, and for other thynges innumerable. We have let these gere [gear or kind] passe, to thentent that the moste principall poyntes of this matter shortely set forth, myght be more easelye knowen. Neyther is here any thynge sayde or gathered to the reproche, sclaunder, or hurte of any man. Allonely those thynges haue been rehersed which semed necessarye to be spoken, to thende [the end] it myght be perceyued that nothyng is receyued in doctrine and ceremonies with us agaynst scripture, or the catholyke churche. For it is manifest and knowen that we moste diligently take hede least any newe or wycked opinions shulde creape into oure churches. These articles before wryten, we thought best to be exhibited and putte forth, accordynge to the commaundement of themperours maiestie, in which myght appere our confession and the summe and effecte of theyr doctryne myght be sene, whiche be teachers and preachers amonge us. Nowe yf in any thing, this confession shal seme to be not perfecte and suffycient, we be redy (god wyllyng) according to the scryptures, to render and gyue a larger information.

To the imperiall maiestie of Cesar the fyfte, his faythfull and true subiectes.

JOHNN DUKE OF SAXON ELECTOR.
GEORGE MARQUES OF BRANDENBRUGH.
ERNEST DUKE OF LUNEBRUGH.
PHILIP LANDGRAUE OF HESSE.
JOHNN FRIDERIKE DUKE OF SAXON.
FRAUNCES DUKE OF LUNEBRUGH.
WOLFGANGE PRYNCE OF ANHALTE.
THE SENATE AND COUNSELL OF NURENBERGE.
THE SENATE REUTLINGE.

Imprynted at London in Fletestrete, by me Robert Redman, dwellynge at the sygne of the George nexte to Saynte Dunstones Churche. *Cum Priuilegio Regali.* [Black letter. No date; but is dedicated to

" the ryght honorable Lord Thomas Crumwell Lorde Preuy seale and chyefe Secretarie to the kynges grace." Who was beheaded on Tower-Hill, 28 July, 1540.]

Original Latin of certain paragraphs, beginning with the paragraph commencing in the English with From whence I pray you.

Unde habent jus Episcopi has traditiones imponendi Ecclesiis ad gravandas conscientias? Extant enim clara testimonia quæ prohibent condere tales traditiones, vel ad promerendam remissionem peccatorum, vel tanquam necessarias ad justiciam novi Testamenti, aut ad salutem.

Paulus Colos. 2. Nemo vos judicet in cibo, potu, parte diei festi, novilunio aut sabbatis. Item, Si mortui estis cum Christo ab elementis mundi, quare tanquam viventes in mundo, decreta facitis? Non attingas, non gustes, non contrectes, quæ omnia pereunt usu, et sunt mandata et doctrinæ hominum, quæ habent speciem sapientiæ. Item ad Titum apertè prohibet traditiones, Non attendentes Judaicis fabulis. et mandatis hominum aversantium veritatem. Et Christus Matth. 15. inquit de his qui exigunt traditiones: Sinite illos, cæci sunt, et duces cæcorum. Et improbat tales cultus, Omnis plantatio quam non plantavit pater meus cœlestis, eradicabitur.

Si jus habent Episcopi onerandi Ecclesias infinitis traditionibus, et illaqueandi conscientias, cur toties prohibet scriptura condere et audire traditiones? cur vocat eas doctrinas dæmoniorum, Num frustrà hæc præmonuit spiritus sanctus? Relinquitur igitur, cùm ordinationes institutæ tanquam necessariæ, aut cum opinione promerendæ remissionis peccatorum, pugnent cum Evangelio, quòd non liceat ullis Episcopis tales cultus instituere aut exigere. Necesse est enim in Ecclesiis retineri doctrinam, de libertate Christianâ, quòd non sit necessaria servitus legis ad justificationem, sicut in Galatis scriptum est, Nolite iterum jugo servitutis subjici. Necesse est retineri præcipuum Evangelii locum, quòd remissionem peccatorum et justificationem per fidem in Christum gratis consequamur, non propter certas observationes, aut propter cultus ab hominibus institutos.

Quid igitur sentiendum est de die Dominico, et similibus ritibus templorum? Ad hæc respondent, quod liceat Episcopis seu pastoribus facere ordinationes, ut res ordine gerantur in Ecclesiâ, non ut per illas mereamur remissionem peccatorum, aut satisfaciamus pro peccatis, aut obligentur conscientiæ, ut judicent esse necessarios cultus, ac sentiant se peccare cum sine offensione aliorum violant. Sic Paulus ordinat, ut in congregatione mulieres velent capita, ut ordine audiantur in Ecclesiâ interpretes &c.

Tales ordinationes convenit Ecclesias propter caritatem et tranquillitatem servare eatenus, ne alius alium offendat, ut ordine et sine tumultu omnia fiant in Ecclesiis. Verùm ita, ne conscientiæ onerentur, ut ducant res esse necessarias ad salutem, ac judicent se peccare cum violant eas sine aliorum offensione, sicut nemo dixerit peccare mulierem, quæ in publicum non velato capite procedit, sine offensione hominum.

Talis est observatio diei Dominici, Paschatis, Pentecostes, et similium feriarum, et rituum. Nam qui judicant Ecclesiæ autoritate, pro sabbato institutam esse diei Dominici observationem, tanquam necessariam, longe errant. Scriptura concedit, ut observatio sabbati nunc sit libera. Docet enim ceremonias Mosaicas post revelatum Evangelium non necessarias esse. Et tamen quia opus erat constituere certum diem, ut sciret populus quando convenire deberet, apparet Ecclesiam ei rei destinasse diem Dominicum, qui ob hanc quoque causam videtur magis placuisse, ut haberent homines exemplum Christianæ libertatis, et scirent nec sabbati nec alterius diei observationem necessariam esse.

Extant prodigiosæ disputationes de mutatione legis, de ceremoniis novæ legis, de mutatione sabbati, quæ omnis ortæ sunt ex falsâ persuasione, quòd oportet in Ecclesiâ cultum esse similem Levitico. Et quòd Christus commiserit Apostolis et Episcopis excogitare novas ceremonias, quæ sint ad salutem necessariæ. Hi errores serpserunt in Ecclesiam, cum justicia fidei non satis clarè doceretur. Aliqui disputant diei Dominici observationem non quidem juris divini esse, sed quasi juris divini, præscribunt de feriis, quatenus liceat operari. Hujusmodi disputationes quid sunt aliud nisi laquei conscientiarum? Quanquam enim conantur epikeizare traditiones, tamen nunquam potest æquitas deprehendi, donec manet opinio necessitatis, quam manere necesse est, ubi ignorantur justicia fidei, et libertas Christiana.

(*From the original Latin of the Confession of Augsburg, with the apology or defence of it by Philip Melancthon,* Impressum Vitebergae per Georgium Rhau, 1531.)

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXIV.

PROSPECTS FROM WAR WITH EGYPT.—FOR WHOSE SAKE THE WAR IS TO BE CARRIED ON.—DESPOTISM OF THE ENGLISH IN THEIR FOREIGN POLICY.

SIR,—As the last piece of public news, I refer to the announcement of the refusal of Mohammed Ali to submit to the terms of the new Holy Alliance of the despotic powers, which the Whigs have got up. As every sensible and energetic man would in his circumstances, he says he will defend himself if attacked, but he will not begin.

And so, I suppose, now, the question of whether a European war is to be brought on or not,—for to that it in all likelihood will come,—the question whether your industry and commerce are to remain in the enjoyment of such fragments of opportunity as in this most anti-commercial of countries it is the pleasure of

your aristocracy to leave to you, or whether these are to be still further curtailed by the game of war by sea and land as carried on for the same aristocracy's interest or amusement, —this weighty and to many of you overwhelming question, rests upon whether some admiral shall have commanders he wants to post, or flag-lieutenants he wants to fit with sloops, —whether his own appetite shall be strong for being called my Lord "Murder and Sudden-Death," and transferred in consequence to the office of legislating for you by himself and by his heirs, with liberty for you to keep and maintain him and his, by a certain number of thousands a-year out of your taxes for ever,—or perhaps, to go lower, whether some sprig of nobility who for his merits would not be taken for second mate in a merchantman, shall spy an opportunity of stopping some honest man's ship at sea, burning some father of a family's boat which is his all, or firing the last improved Congreve into some poor woman's nursery, and looking to happy and glorious England for promotion for the gallant deed. For remember, the chances are not limited to what men may be obliged to do, in opposition it may be to the feelings of their own honourable hearts, by the necessity of obedience to orders which they cannot question or control. The worst chances arise, out of the acknowledged certainty that an aristocrat must be supported, and consequently rewarded for whatever mischief he may please to do. There is no known absurdity, no utterable breach of the common sense and policy by which the herd of men are obliged to regulate their actions, to which it would not be possible to fit a name and family which should carry with them the necessity of submitting to the consequences in silence, or even of declaring the brown loaf to be most admirable mutton.

And what is doing here? Is there anybody to consult? Is there any popular branch? It there any use in knocking at any door, to say the fat is likely to be in the fire? In short is there anybody at home? Is there as much care taken of the concerns of an extensive nation, as an old woman takes when she goes out a charring, and leaves the parish prentice with orders to let her know if any of the children set fire to their clothes?

There is nothing of the kind. And why? It is the time for shooting various little birds, from cock-sparrows upwards. What have the cock-sparrows to do with it; do we augur from them, as the Romans did from chickens? No, our rulers are busy shooting them. Are the sentries from the Horse-Guards gone cock-shooting? No, they are not; low

men must do their work all the year round, or rest one at a time. Is there no parliament then, to ask a question in? No; the rule in "the envy of surrounding nations" is, that there shall be no parliament in cock-shooting time, because parliament must be cock-shooters. And why must they be, as the Irish say, "that same"? Because if they were not, your trade would be free, your commerce would be open with all the world, the owners of the soil would cease to be kept in rents out of your pockets, the masters of the soil cock-shoot and you do not, therefore to secure all this, parliament cannot sit in cock-shooting time, for otherwise the cock-shooters would not come. You see how it all resolves itself; how fearfully and wonderfully made, is the system it is our joy to live under; how miraculously and supernaturally adapted, to carrying on the concerns of a chandler's shop, of a counting-house, or of a nation.

It has often occurred to me to think, that though it would be plainly irrational in ourselves to look forward to seeing anything of the kind, we might encourage our children, to think of putting theirs, on endeavouring to lay the foundations for having something like a government. By which I mean a government in which there really should be something like the same adaptation of means to ends, which men exercise in the concerns of common life. No man, for instance, builds a ship, and provides for its being six months of the year at sea without an officer on deck, or anybody to tell that there is a squall ahead. If a jackanapes declares he cannot be at sea in grouse-shooting time, the reply is ready that there are plenty more that will; and it would be a very odd proposal, which should go to confine the choice of masters and mates to the grouse-shooting fraternity. Men do not act so ridiculously in their private affairs; no man is an idiot but for his country's use; there must be patriotism in it, before anybody can be got to write himself down an ass.

And now having ascertained that there is no stopping it, any more than stopping a haystack from going to leeward, in the first place because there is no organization for the thing being done, and secondly because there is nobody on board to do it if there was;—let us ask, what it is all about, and why? That we are to suffer, may be plain; but what moves the blockheads who are born to the shuffling of the cards, to give us the bad instead of the good? Why might not peace and quietness have been winked at? What is the matter? What is the cause of the uproar? Has anybody attacked us? Has anybody made an engagement with us, and broken it for their own

convenience to our hurt? It was but the other day for instance, that Russia broke a solemn agreement to which England was a party, on the subject of Cracow. And the minister quietly answered, that there was no way of causing the agreement to be kept but by a war, and he would not go to war. In other words, he bared the ministerial bottom, and cried "Johnny, come kick me now" to all the nations of the earth, proclaiming as the accredited representative of the country, that England is and can be no guarantee to the amount of five farthings, and in fact the smaller the amount the more certain the nullity of the guarantee. In which, as in parallel cases in private life, he overlooked the fact, that a bold protest against a wrong, goes far to rally opinion and support, and that he who will not even venture to protest, incurs the suspicion of being a party to the fact. But we must go on, under our bare-bottomed ministry, till the chapter of accidents, for we can do nothing for ourselves, shall come to our relief.

Has anything then recurred like this? Has there been any breach of compact towards us, which though it might be necessary to uncover the country's nakedness a month ago to Russia, is under circumstances that according to the ministerial code of honour for such cases made and provided, dispense with the repetition of the ceremonial now? Not a shadow. Has any Englishman suffered in person, goods, station, or prospects? Not the remotest pretence for it; on the contrary, myriads must suffer in all these by the course at present adopted, and millions by the consequences. What is it then; where is it; can *you* tell, or *you*, or *you?* A semi-barbarous empire, whose power was great when all nations were in a similar condition, is falling to pieces in its remoter members, through sheer want of the civilization which forms the cement in other countries. One ruler of a distant province bound by no tie but that of having been overrun some centuries ago by armies, conceived the idea of importing European civilization and ceasing to be barbarian. He carried it on for forty years with vigour. It is not likely that he acted always exactly as if he had put himself under the orders of three Whig Commissioners at Somerset House; and he had countless local and particular interests to struggle with, which made his position anything but a bed of roses. By the will of heaven, however, on he went, till at last he was to find that

> "England everywhere, the general foe
> "Of truth and freedom wheresoe'er they grow,
> "Is by, when tyrants strike, to help the blow."

A Whig administration can do nothing but get up insurrections against him. Eight thousand stand of arms are to be sent to the coast of Syria, in hopes of persuading some ill-starred people to bawl for their lord the Lord knows who, the real and legitimate master of the true Seraglio. There is some reason to believe, that all this has been a ridiculous failure; and that by joining in the laugh of Europe, we shall individually redeem ourselves from the disgrace of being anything but enforced parties. The truth is that the conduct of the actual ministry, acting upon the confidence that they had a sure lease of office by their bargain with the miserables calling themselves Whig-Radicals in the House of Commons, has been everywhere so intolerably bad,—so contrary to all we have been accustomed to teach our children, or have imbibed ourselves from the good men who went before us,—that all men of honesty, all men of humanity, all men of principle, all men of honour so far as that implies adherence to a virtuous rule accompanied by a sensitiveness to even enforced departure from it, all men who have learned in the lessons of antiquity what was conducive to the true happiness of nations, or have traced from home-bred experience the connexion between crime and its effects on individuals and larger bodies, are under the necessity of avowing some relaxation of the ordinary maxim, which requires that private persons should profess a general interest in the successes of the measures of their government. We cannot be knaves, or tyrants, or fools, because our government desires it. There is a limit to all things, and there is a limit here. Look at the working classes, standing up solemnly before their Maker, and praying His interference against their rulers in behalf of the oppressed nations of India, through whose countries they have just seen a British army led, on the most execrable breach and disavowal of all principles consonant with just and British feeling, that stain the page of history, and accompanied with horrible and revolting circumstances of military cruelty, which are coming out bit by bit in the pages of historians of the campaign, and even through the revelations of the Military Gazettes in their untoward zeal for their defence; levelling the British officer to the rank of hack executioner and butcher's journeyman, and making every man curse his fate, and creep about under a load of conscious degradation, who has been unfortunate enough to pass his life in the dishonoured office. When the working-classes have got to this, "Call you that nothing?"—as the Stuart said when the soldiers cheered at Hounslow. Men are revolting against them; I mean the mind's revolt, the soul's

emetic. The Tories sinned, but with a cause; and these men sin with none. They must go off; the Scripture phrase may be too rough for use, but the land is sick of them, and that sickness will bring its own relief. But to be got rid of they must be assailed; and the only point on which they are open to assault, is by assailing the men who professing to be watchmen on the people's towers, jobbed us away with a promise of impunity, and gave us a specimen of what a government must be, which can contrive to rid itself of all political check, by a compromise with the attorneys of the party which ought to have opposed.

London, 2 *Sept.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXV.

THE "PARTITION PRINCIPLE" AT THE ELECTIONS.—CO-OPERATION OF EXTREME PARTIES POSSIBLE.

SIR,—The *Sun* of the 4th does me the honour to notice the contents of my Letter to the Secretary to the "Lovett and Collins" Committee in July last; which tempts me to take the opportunity for further discussion of the principle concerned. And the more, because the *Sun* is decidedly the most advanced of the Liberal daily papers; and is the journal which, whenever its "call" shall come, will move onward and take the lead in the people's cause.

That Letter, it is stated, "recommends the Chartists to join, at the elections, with either Whigs or Tories, who will contribute to elect Chartists."

And why should they not? If a party of any conceivable kind, have any cause or purpose at all, upon what imaginable motive are they not to desire to see an organ of their own brought into parliament, though with the result of throwing out an individual of any other party besides? What is there the man of the other party is to do for them, that could not have been done by the man of their own? And why are they to give up what would have been done by the man of their own, and would not have been done, or would have been opposed, by the other?

Put now an actual case, and see how it looks. There is a place where the Whigs and Tories are both in force; and a third party (which for convenience shall be called the party

of Further Reform) contrives by a successful exertion of the tactics of a minority, to bring in one representative of its own, in company with one of either of the other parties. And let some enticing personage be sent down, to convince the "Further Reformers" that they have done the wrong thing. How will it be gone about? Will it be said, "You ought to have let two Whigs come in, instead of a Whig and a Further Reformer; and so you would have lost all the difference between your own man and a Whig"? Or would it be, you ought to have let in one Whig and one Tory; and then the result to you would have been the same"? Or would it be, "You ought to have let two Tories come in; and you would have been greatly the better for that"? In which of these would the Siren have the smallest prospect of success?

There is only one possible case more; therefore to that must the Siren's song be supposed to be confined. And that is, "You ought to have helped to bring in two Whigs, instead of a Further Reformer and a Tory." And now to see the reasons, why we ought to have brought in two Whigs, instead of a man of our own way of thinking and a Tory.

To make this stand upon its legs, it must be proved to us, First, that the two Whigs would have done something for us; Secondly, that what they would have done for us is of more value to us, than what we can do for ourselves by having a representative in parliament with the set-off of a Tory.

Now all this falls to the ground, if the Whigs will *do nothing for us at all.* The Tory can do us no harm, as far as votes go; for our man can always balance him if he likes. All we can possibly lose, is what the two Whigs would have done for us; and if that be nothing, in the language of the schools *cadit quæstio.*

But suppose what the Whigs are to do, is not absolutely nothing; but that there is a discernible quantity, which can be taken up with the aid of a forceps and placed in the scale. What is there on the other side to set against it, and what are the comparative weights? And here comes into play the principle, of the enormous rapidity with which the value of organs rises in proportion to the minority in which their party finds itself, and particularly when the inferiority is great. What the Unrepresented and Slave Class want at present, is not votes towards giving them a majority, for heaven knows they are far enough from that;—but *voices at all.* They want the power of having their thoughts uttered; they want to break through the silence which the policy of their enemies has doomed them to, and which for that very reason they want to dis-

pel. And truly, they are almost at the extreme case. If the value of organs be inversely as their number, the value to them is as near to the infinite as it is easy to devise. What have they, whom have they? Who has travelled twenty miles, or gone to the expense of a foot of letter-press, to serve their cause? Has anybody tried to rally them? No. Is anybody likely to try? No. Especial care was taken, that all who were likely to do it should be got rid of. Hence arises the value of the object, and the certainty that half a dozen real people's men, would be cheaply purchased by a hecatomb of the best Whigs that walk upon the earth.

But there is worse than this. The heretical pravity of the Slave Class goes so far as to doubt, whether there is not evidence that the removal of the Whigs and the substitution of the Tories, would be a good in itself. They have got to the state in which Frenchmen were in 1814; where though they admitted that it was a heart-breaking thing to give up visions of glory, and confess long struggles to have been for nothing, they were beaten down by the invincible "*Nous serons mieux*" ["We shall be better off"] which was forced on them at every turn. The Whigs have broken down the national spring, and forced us to wish for our old Bourbons back again. They began by a refusal to do more for Reform. Then they got to a junction with the old aristocracy and clergy, for starving us to death by inches in their gaols. And now, as their last resource for distracting public attention and rallying the support of all that is discreditable in the country, they are hunting through the four quarters of the world for a dishonourable war to plunge us into. We are in daily expectation of hearing of their cutting the throats of our harmless tea-makers in China, and having to support a "Lord Laudanum" and a "Viscount Morphine" as our personal contribution towards those most filthy murders. We have the same feelings on the subject, that we should have if asked to pay for a "Marquis Courvoisier;" the same hearty contempt, hatred, and individual aversion, to both principals and instruments. But how can we help ourselves; we were born to it; and heaven, as well known, allows the throats to be cut first, and draws the bill for it at a long date afterwards. We abhor the authors of these things, with a freshness of disgust like that with which we regard a man who has rolled in the gutter of to-day. The Tories were in the gutter twenty years ago; and the smell has in part gone off. But setting aside all instant provocations, we look calmly and systematically to the evidence, that the Tories with the Whigs in op-

position, would be a harmless and innoxious race of governors, compared with the Whigs supported in office under circumstances which promise to them perfect impunity, and rally round them all the bad passions that exist among the felonry of the country besides. And it is perfectly astonishing to see what the force of the said felonry is;—what a nation of thieves and savages we are, and how little we could plead on the score of our own merits, if a superior Power were to proceed to wipe us out of the list of nations by some of the processes by which public crimes have been tardily avenged before. There has been a strong delusion for the last twenty years, consisting in a belief among well-meaning men, that the world was growing more honest, more humane, more conscious of the interest it had in repressing thieves and cultivating the arts of peace. If there was ever any truth in it, three years of uncontrolled Whig government have carried the world back again. We sigh for any accident that should substitute the Tories; on the same principle that a man would prefer a chained lion in his bed-chamber, to an uncontrolled visitation of rat. This is the point the Whigs have brought things to. They have demonstrated that they are "good creatures," in opposition and no where else. They have exhausted all hopes of their doing further good; and now they are plunging into evil, with the desperation with which semi-converted Yahoos might disappoint the expectations of their masters.

The *Scotsman* is not the *True Scotsman;* there are sharper-sighted Scotsmen than he. The charge against the Whigs is, not that they will not go on fast enough, but that they will not go on at all, and that they kick at and abuse all who would make them move. It may be true enough, that the Chartists acted like simpletons, when on being asked to move on to an open breach, they declined for fear of "a revolution," and then went and discharged their pieces against a house-side, as they did literally at Newport. But it was not for doing too little, that the Whigs came down upon them; it was for wanting to do anything at all. It was all well, while it served the Whig purpose of getting in and keeping there. It was all ill, when it went against the Whig purpose of standing still. The Whigs went on, just as long as was conducive to their objects; and now they have run down, there is nothing to be done but if possible wind up the clock. Put the Whigs where they were; and perhaps they will go again as before.

The *Sun* notes the fact of the Letter having been noticed in the Tory journals. This certainly looks a little, as if it had hit the joints of the harness somewhere. There must have

been room for such a Letter, when there was room for it in journals of such different kinds. The co-operation of extreme parties, though neither easy nor safe, is not absolutely impossible. In its legitimate and honourable exercise, it must be principally based upon this;—that each party makes its own estimate of the probable consequences, and is content to abide by its own judgment of the results, without demanding to compare notes on the expectations of the other party. If one chuses to say, "These are small men, and what we shall gain by combining with them for a particular point, will be more than any advantage they will ever make by it in opposition to ourselves;"—and if the other says, "We have not the dread of these people that some have, for if they come in, they will find themselves controlled in a way they do not calculate on;"—it is difficult to prove that each party has not a right to use its own wits, and take its own course. One thing is certain;—that a party which has been deceived, abused, persecuted, imprisoned, hunted, and starved, is, not the party on whom any nice law is to be put on the question of how it shall act against its enemies, or where it shall and shall not look for combination in support.

London, 9 *Sept.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXVI.

How the Holy Alliance has come about.—The "Dumb Dogs."—Filthy Whig Policy in India.—Whig Playing at Holy Alliance.—Uncleanly associations with Royalty.—Reform in Egypt.

Sir,—Since my last, our position has been decided. We are all the slaves, not of the Lamp, but of the new Holy Alliance which Lords Palmerston and Ponsonby have set up. It was clear that to something of this kind it must come, from the moment your "good Reformers" let out, that they were too comfortable to think of endangering their own positions, and so gave *carte blanche* to the ministers.

And now see what the ministry of the "good Reformers" has done, feeling its way inch by inch, as was the part of sensible men, and as they say a sensible elephant will do, when it is suspicious of the ground beneath its feet.

First came the Canada business. No turn-out. It was plain and palpable that a minister might put down the Right of Supply in Canada, and in distinct words declare its virtual

non-existence anywhere, and there was no danger of his supporters substantially abandoning him. A few might grumble; but always with especial caution that the grumblers should be inadequate to any dangerous effect.

The next thing experimented on, was the feeling of the "good Reformers" on the Right of *Habeas Corpus*, as involved in the cases of the prisoners brought here for defending the British laws and constitution in Canada, and then sent away privily. Nothing was plainer, than that they did not mean to move.

The next experiment was on the Right of Petition. The ministry could not declare the act of petitioning to be felony; but it could get a vote of the House of Commons for the petitions being put into a bag without comment, which was just as good in the end. A half dozen voices squeaked a mock resistance; where any two resolute men, good attenders and acting into each other's hands, might have defeated the plot, and might do it to-morrow. Here too it was ascertained then, that all was safe; the "good Reformers" were dumb dogs, that barked not, neither was offence likely to be found in their mouths.

Public Meetings were next touched upon; and the probability is that they gave way before the ministerial threat, sufficiently for the ministerial purpose. For nothing is clearer than that the "dumb dogs" would not have given mouth, if the minister had proceeded to execute his projected "modification" of the Bill of Rights. He had carried his point, which was to convince himself that the "good Reformers" would sell the Bill of Rights as easily as the Right of Supply.

The next feeler was in India, and a pretty strong one it was. The detachment of the Whig government in that quarter of the globe, sends a large army, at a most enormous expense squeezed out of the bones and muscles of those who have the misfortune to be its subjects,—and employs the military of our own country, who are afterwards to be returned upon us here with the habits and feelings they have contracted from the disgraceful contact,—*to do what?* Not to attack an enemy, or to resist some injury indicted or contemplated, but to displace the existing ruler of a distant country, and substitute another by force who from the baseness of his life and manners, and his utter disqualification for every function of government, was known to be the most distasteful possible to the inhabitants; and this under the rascal policy of profiting by the weakness which must ensue, and by the necessity that such an instrument must be simply

subservient to those who maintained him against the aversion of the people. Put the case that there was some distant power in existence, which should come down upon our coasts with a demand that the Brunswick dynasty should be abolished, and that there should be substituted the weakest, wickedest ruler such power had been able to pick out, and for no other reason avowed, than because his weakness and wickedness, and the hatred with which he must consequently be viewed, would neutralize the influence of our country, and make us entirely dependent on the conqueror's beck. Imagine all the phrases of just and laudable reprobation, which would be bestowed on the authors of such a policy;—conjure up all the terms, expressive though not elegant, into which our vernacular English is in the practice of concentrating the manifestation of popular hatred and contempt, and add to them all the refined though sometimes not less cutting circumlocutions by which the learned and the fastidious are in the habit of propounding the self-same meanings in a different dress;—frame what an academician might call a *florilegium* of infamy, an anthology of the blossoms of disgrace, and then ask two questions,—first, whether they are not all well-merited and in fact inseparable from the policy supposed, its authors and abettors,—and secondly, whether we should not individually make a glorious and honourable exchange, if it were possible for us to transfer our nationality to the basest among tribes or nations, as the means of getting rid of the disgrace attached to being the tools and victims of such a government. Talk of rejoicing in the name of Briton! They make the name of Briton synonymous with scoundrel, and then bid us to rejoice.

And what is the excuse, the ground, the reason produced to the sovereign on the throne and to the labourer in his cottage? That he is "legitimate." And this from the servants of a Queen, who if their principle were true, would herself be a usurper the descendant of usurpers, whom it would be the duty of every man to call on to come down from her unlicensed station, and make room for any consolidation of iniquity that foreigners might find it meet to substitute. O how loyalty boils and rages in the breasts of men of untameable honour and irrepressible fidelity, when the question is of encouraging a British sovereign to acts dangerous to the welfare of the people and the safety of the throne,—and how meeker than mice are they, when gross and treasonable insult is offered to the pretended idol of their worship, in the shape of insolent denial of the principle by which it holds its seat!

But they have done more; they have been curious in the

insult. The government that did this, gave directions to the commander of the "legitimatizing" force (for no man in his senses, and with the feelings of respect always to a greater or less degree contracted by a life of military service, would have done it without) to prompt the abhorred creature he was to place on a dishonoured throne, to establish, in God's name what?—a military *order!*—what a laugh in hell—and to go through the humiliation of tying his creature's *cross* to his own button-hole, and inducing men under his influence to do the like. He will say, he was a harmless agent. Be it so; we go at the advisers and inventors. And this disgraceful and ridiculous badge, at this moment a man might be in danger of rubbing shoulders with, who should present himself on any occasion of duty or of courtesy at the court of what, spite of all traitors in the world, is a Queen as well as woman, and as such should not be personally levelled with the infamous and the vile.

See how his acquaintances speak of the brother sovereign of our Victoria, the fraternal Majesty of Afghanistan, Shah *what is it*,—the patron and hero, perhaps the saint, whose "order," save the mark, is to glow on the breasts of honourable men and gentlemen, and point aspiring youth the road to fame.

"The accounts of the conduct and condition of Shah Soo-"jah continue the same as formerly,—that his habits are those "of a haughty, silly, sensual, confirmed reprobate, totally un-"worthy of British countenance or protection, who, the mo-"ment that our forces were withdrawn from the country, "would become the deserved victim of his own outraged sub-"jects, by whom he is held in equal hatred and derision."—*Bombay Times of July* 22. *In Standard of* 9 *Sept.* 1840.

This is the Whigs playing at Holy Alliances. And remember who they are that forward this testimony. Men not peculiarly removed from the influences of a government; but on the contrary forming a society where the ramifications of power extend themselves to all of a certain standing, with something like the home-felt interest which may exist among the immediate followers of a court. But still men who, in spite of sarcasm which might be true or false at the time of utterance, have carried without evaporation by the Equator's heats, much of their country's virtues into a foreign land, and live there in domestic sanctity and honour, trusting that no foul deed shall hinder them or theirs from returning to their fatherland in peace. Your modern Indian when he comes back, is no ghost-fearing wretch, frightening the land from its pro-

priety with tales of sleepless nights passed under the leaden eye of him he called from the unarmed crowd and sent to death. Such to the guilty; to the greater part, remembrances of power beneficently used, of evil hindered and of good dispensed, of friendships found or formed among strange brethren, come in the evening of life's day, and soothe, not agonise the passage to the grave. These are not men to be despised, nor men whose verdict can be overlooked when this great question shall be tried before England's honest millions.

Hear more; for a single account may be rash and unsupported.

"Our *protégé*, the Shah Soojah, continues his career of low "beastly sensual indulgence, undeterred by the estrangement "or contempt of his own subjects,—unpersuaded by the hints "of the English residents. The time in fact seems fast ap- "proaching when the exactions he extorts from the people "to be wasted in sensual or in childish extravagances will be "borne by them no longer; and already the question becomes "an urgent one of how far we should waste the strength of the "army and the resources of the exchequer in supporting or "countenancing a headstrong despot, with whom a moment's "connection exposes our characters to native scorn from the "vices he reflects on us."—*Letter from India of July* 23. *In Morning Herald of* 9 *Sept.* 1840.

Hear now what others say, not Indian, but home-bred critics; broad-sheet philosophers, whose calling is to gather up the passing facts, and knead them into history.

"The profligate old puppet who, by the mere force of British bayonets, now occupies the throne of Cabool, grows daily more unpopular."—*Standard,* 9 *Sept.* 1840.

What would have been said of republicans like you and me, if at the time we were avowing ourselves to be engaged in compact and allegiance to the actual sovereign, we had been pulling down the foundations of respect for monarchy which they say is built on *honour*, by bringing a "profligate old puppet" under the nose of England's Queen, and scandalizing the name of female royalty by the uncleanly association? if we, no flatterers but yet bound by duty, had ushered the "haughty, silly, sensual, confirmed reprobate" into the presence, and said "Madam, this is the company we are pleased to find for you;" or had done the honours to the "low and beastly," and then smirked our sense of the service done to monarchy in Europe? Up then, republicans, and cry shame. Will no loyal subject send to India a bed-pan of the newest, some patent *inodore*, and beg the gentlemen who have got Shah

Soojah's "orders," to drop them quietly into its oblivious round, and let them be deposited by the pariah who does such office for the government, at some safe point beyond the Southern Cape, where they shall never rise to tell of the honours the Whigs invented for the British Crown?

This was a bold stroke, and illustrative of the connexion between the rights of the people and the dignity of the throne. But the "dumb dogs" gave no voice, and all was safe. The Chinese felony came next; and there some anti-populars moved, to the saving of their individual conscience and reputation, but with the weakness of men who fear to call the voice of the people in aid of the voice of God. Still all was safe; the watchmen were all bought and paid for, and so would not; or they were twaddlers, and could not; in one way or other it was clear, that no liberty that was taken would be dangerous. And so in the fullness of time came on us this last disgrace, which we must swallow and our children; the being plunged again into the Alliance of

> —Europe's Kings, who never yet combin'd
> But (like those upper Stars, that when conjoin'd,
> Shed war and pestilence) to scourge mankind.

And is there any difference between the motive now and elsewhere? None. The Egyptian Pasha is Reform moving in the Turkish Empire: and he will probably beat them all at last, as Reform has done before. He cannot be expected to wear the exact guise of a Whig lord in the struggles for the Reform Bill; but he is in earnest, which is more than the other was. The pretext that we were engaged to preserve the integrity of the Turkish power, is a simple fraud, existing, at the most, on ministerial reservations never ratified by public opinion. It might be reasonable and wise to agree to hinder any revolution in the Turkish Empire by foreign force; but there was no compact to guard it against the alterations which were the necessary results of its own defects. If we could look in the *chancellerie* at Constantinople, is there no inchoate treaty for an interference with the question of Repeal,—no *casus fœderis* in which a force of any kind could be embarked for service against the Chartist powers? If not, there ought to be, or else the Whig diplomacy has done by halves. And then the subaltern insolence which has been set on to increase the chance of war! Consuls in their best clothes, sent to ask the ruler of a country, "Who dares brave the edict of the powers?" The people of England, if they are wise. The people of any other country, that has a mind to fire the mine from which our blockheads had not the sense to keep the

match. Why does not France move to "the rampart of the Rhine;" it is there that free Europe will look for her advance. Of all the fools, commend us to the fools who cannot let well alone. But what is to be done in a country whose destinies are ruled by a feeble aristocracy who never knew more of the struggles of life than the difficulty of swallowing what was put into their mouths with a spoon, and with the popular branch sold to the obligation of dying, in any ditch, for the administration that will preserve its place and theirs?

London, 16 *Sept.*, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXVII.

LOVETT AND COLLINS ON CHARTISM.—THE CHARTIST "GALILEOS."—THEIR PLAN.—ADVANTAGES OF THE "PENNY" SYSTEM.

SIR,—It gives me great pleasure to see you have been beforehand with me in a design I had of writing on the last new embodyment of Chartism, as it has come from the hands of the spirits long "in strong prison bound," for being a little too hasty in trying to scramble over the enemy's defences. It is most interesting to see what has been going on in the breasts of these working-class Galileos, and to inquire whether imprisonment has more virtue to cure a Chartist philosopher of his Chartism, than to make an astronomer believe the earth stands still. I shall try, therefore, what may be picked up without going over the ground you have already taken.

"The spirit," they say, "which has awakened, pervades, and moves the multitude, is that of intellectual inquiry." That is to say, the masses have begun to find out, that their condition has been and will be made better or worse, by matters within human arrangement; and to this they have added a vehement doubt, whether as far as regards *their* interests, the worst way has not and will not be taken instead of the best, and for this simple reason, that somebody else has had the settling of everything, and that *their* interests and feelings have not only not been paramount, but have had no say at all. And in particular, they are highly discontented with the reasons which have been given them, why they should be exceedingly self-satisfied and happy. They have been told, for instance, that they were the envy of surrounding nations, because under the guidance of their aristocracy they had set fire to *so* many capitals, destroyed *so* many ships

and vessels, imposed despotic governments on *so* many people who ought to have been independent and free, and established or conquered *so* many colonies in which their betters should carry on the trade of cutting boots into shoes, and fill their own pockets by the invention of taking everything twice over out of the pockets of the working-people. On all these subjects a doubt, a scepticism,—dangerous word—has come over them. They are not as their fathers were, the credulous, the much-enduring. And it remains to be seen what will be done by that posterity, which they are taking all pains to make more dangerous than themselves.

Was it worth while to send these men to gaol, to have them employ themselves there, with few appliances perhaps of paper and pen, or even slate and pencil, in reckoning up for the benefit of their friends when the time came, the expenses of all the wars since the Revolution, and making them three thousand millions, to cast away hundreds of millions as a very little thing; and then reckoning the number of their countrymen "done to death" in the pursuit of the same laudable occupations, at something near eighteen hundred millions of men? Have the Whigs to learn, that a man may be set upon a bench with a threat to be starved instead of half-starved if he looks agreeable or disagreeable except as the authority present shall direct, and still not reach the mind, nor stay the process of the avenging spirit looking to the day of freedom and retribution?

The Chartists have found out and clearly ascertained, first, that the holders of political power in England are "irresponsible except to their own order," and secondly, that the consequence is, as might be expected, that they make no scruple of inflicting any injuries upon the classes to whom they are not responsible, if they see in it the prospect of benefit to their own. And when to this the Chartists at large can add an equal knowledge of the ways in which the oppressive classes work their woe,—a familiarity as practical and home-felt with the details of the machinery by which they are ground to the dust,—they will be in the road to be at all events fellow-workers towards the removal of their evils. Hitherto, and so far as their proceedings are to be taken from what may be considered their official documents and language, they may call to mind the story of the foreigner who in his extremity exclaimed, "I *will* be drowned, nobody *shall* help me." They have gone straight into the enemy's jaws; deliberately marched upon the very points where it was his interest to bid them. What can be done for men who believe, or

affect to believe, that to remove the prohibition on the exchange of their productions for food, would save them a shilling a week in the price of corn, but take three shillings from their wages? Who of course believe, by the converse of the proposition, that prohibiting the exchange of their productions, is a happy invention for adding three shillings a week to their wages, while it increases their expense in bread by the inferior sum of one? What is to be done for men or with them, whom it is safe to approach and tell, that the higher the price of their food is raised by exclusion, the more of it they are sure to get, upon the principle that the less there is, the more there will be to divide; and this they are to shout for under the title of "the rights of labour." The followers of Walter Tyler, (called Wat because he was assassinated by the gentlemen at a conference), honest man though he was and intrinsically engaged in a good cause, were not farther from the probability of ultimate success, than the Chartists under their hitherto avowed official principles. How far all these have been serious and real, or how far they have been the acts of individuals whom the others were glad to follow for their activity and energy, will be best shown by the portion of their history which is to come. The martyrs of Warwick gaol have manifestly hit the nail upon the head. They cry "knowledge, knowledge," as men cry "lights, lights" in some domestic alarm or agitation. Into this in fact may be resolved, the revelation which has been made to them in their dreary Patmos.

Their plan has simplicity in its favour, and what with many people goes a long way, example. They have discovered that the signatures attached to the National Petition,—the *petition monstre* as a modern Frenchman would call it,—were one million, two hundred and eighty-three thousand, and that a penny a-week from each of these would amount to somewhere about £280,000 per annum, a sum competent to found and keep up a most potent quantity of education. Now this is exactly the financial basis *on which John Wesley raised the Methodist Society;* with the difference, that the numbers of the petitioners *now*, if doubled as they ought to be for the women, imply *four times* the mass of interested, that the Methodists have attained to in their palmiest time. And the analogy is the more valuable in my eyes, because it has often occurred to me that the same honest zeal, the same delight in having found an object which relieved the dullness of common life and made a man feel he was not part of the clay he trod on, the same readiness to walk ten miles to hear

"a good discourse" upon the subjects of his interest, which as a boy I was familiar with among the Methodists of the working classes, have transferred themselves to an anxiety for bettering men's present state by means of political improvement. To those who have chanced to see, as I have, an absconding Chartist handed from house to house, introduced to trusted strangers as "the man the police are after in all directions," smiled on by the women, reverentially glanced at by the children, and wooed by the servant-maid to know if there is not something he would like to take,—the likeness to "the blessed Mr. Rentowel" fleeing before the face of Clavers's dragoons, must have been past resisting, and have made them feel how easily a bad government can transfer popular enthusiasm from one kind of victim to another.

The "penny" system may therefore be held to have experience on its side, and to be clearly preferable to the "shilling a quarter" system for the same reasons as made it chosen in the other instance. The difference between parting with a penny a-week, and with a shilling all at once, to persons by whom every the smallest coin has been obtained by a specifiable toil, is something like the difference between going a mile a-week to work, and going twelve miles at once; the things are not the same, though the sums may. The giver of a penny a-week has only one pennyworth of instant temptation to break off his subscription and apply the proceeds to something else; the giver of a shilling at once has twelve. John Wesley knew this; and the political Methodists should take the hint.

The ex-prisoners have a most reasonable doubt of the propriety of giving up the education of their children to any government, and "the strongest abhorrence" of giving any such power to an irresponsible one. The abhorrers are right. For what assignable reason does anybody think Miss Monflathers, or any other personification of educational ardour, applies herself to the training of "the lower orders," except for the purpose of training them in the way it is for her interest they should go? This has in all ages been the polished arrow in the quiver of that branch of despotic power, which did not profess to act immediately by pike or gun. "Give us the opportunity to mould the minds of the people from their youth up; allow us to fill their minds with the ideas of false duties, false crimes, and ingraft the habits of fearing where they ought not, and of not fearing where they ought; and, though we will not assert their entire security from change, we will engage that you shall acknowledge the benefit of the results." And in this there is nothing so monstrous

after all. Would *you* vote your money to teach what you thought directly opposed to the interests of your class? The inference is clear; what you want doing, do for yourselves, like other people. Be assured the "upper classes" will never give sixpence, but to get a crown's worth from you. There are a few talkers, who may mean well; but they will be allowed to talk and nothing else, till the profitable conclusion just hinted at, is in some way coupled with closing with their plans.

To conclude then, these Chartist leaders have struck out a great light; and anybody who opposes it, wants to keep the Chartists in ignorance for interested purposes. It does not follow that everybody who wants to see them learn, is right in what he would propose to them for their studies; but it is clear that he dares submit his proposals for what may come of them by examination and inquiry, and that the opposite side dares not.

London, 22 *Sept.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Bolton Free Press.

No. I.

THE ROYAL MANCHESTER ANTI-CORN-LAW LEAGUE AND COVENANT.—PROTECTION TO SPINNING-JENNIES.—SAUCE FOR THE GOOSE IS SAUCE FOR THE GANDER.—LANDLORD-RIDDEN ENGLAND THE WONDER OF THE CIVILIZED WORLD.

SIR,—As you have had the goodness to invite me to send a letter on passing events to your journal, there can perhaps be nothing fitter for a commencement than a running commentary on the proceedings of the "Royal Bucks Agricultural Association" at Aylesbury, on the eighth anniversary meeting and dinner, the Duke of Buckingham in the chair.

And first, how comes the title "Royal" there? Is it meant for a declaration, that on the question of whether Great Britain shall be opened to commerce and its industry to food, the Crown has already taken its stand? Is it intended to announce to every hungry artisan, whose produce could be exchanged for bread but may not, that the Sovereign is pledged to resist his emancipation from such bondage, as a grandfather and uncle were pledged to resist the religious emancipation of another portion of the community? If it is not, why is it there? To "seem what you are, or else be what you seem," is an old piece of advice, which the responsible advisers of the Crown on this occasion if there are any, would have done well

to bear in mind. There is but one way to settle the question effectually. Will leave be given for the immediate assumption of the title of the "Royal Manchester Anti-Corn-Law League and Covenant"? If it will, the public mind may be at rest. If it will not, the Crown has been advised to take part against the people's bread. The "League and Covenant" should bring the question to issue without delay.

"The noble Chairman gave, 'Prosperity to the Royal Bucks Agricultural Association.' He observed that it was a great gratification for him to meet that society as its president, after it had been established so many years in that county. They would recollect that the society had been established in times of distress, for the protection of the agricultural interest, and for the improvement of the condition of the labouring agricultural classes."—*Standard*, 17 *Sept.* 1840.

Now, for the clear understanding of this and what may follow it, imagine the corresponding case from the other side. Let it be supposed that after having for a quarter of a century had a tax on home-grown corn, as the means of increasing the quantity which must be bought with manufactures abroad, the Royal Manchester Anti-Corn-Law League and Covenant were holding their eighth anniversary meeting and dinner, and the morning had been "ushered in by a spinning match, for which 25 jennies were entered, but not more than 15 started." Suppose then, the dinner despatched, and the President, noble or working-class, calling to the recollection of the society, that it "had been established in times of distress for the protection of the manufacturing interest, and for the improvement of the condition of the labouring manufacturing classes." What would have been the meaning of the terms, and what the construction which the agriculturists, with their noble Chairman at their head, would have put upon them?

The first inference they would have drawn would have been, that though the manufacturers had succeeded in putting a manifest robbery upon the agriculturists, like other robbers they had not flourished by their trade, but after five-and-twenty years of their own way, had been found complaining of distress, and crying "Give, give," as is the nature of allowed thieves and horse-leeches. And after commenting on this ominous fact with all the bitterness a sense of injury could supply, they would not be slow in deciding that by "protection of the manufacturing interest" the manufacturers meant the continuance of their wrong, and by "improvement of the condition of the manufacturing classes" they intended to introduce the hypocritical, and possibly totally unfounded,

pretext, of benevolence to some part and portion of society, as a stalking-horse for their dishonesty to the remainder.

Of this or the like, the agriculturists would not spare one word; and they would be fools if they did. Every man has a right to call a spade a spade, when he finds himself attacked by palpable invasions of common justice. But proceed and see how ready would be their answer to each successive pretension of their manufacturing plunderers.

"Their object was, the protection of their own interests."—*Ibid.*

True. Messrs. the manufacturers; but are they *honest* interests? Many a man protects his own interests, and is hanged for it. Where is your *right* to say that we the agriculturists, shall not sell in the market as much corn as we can grow? You say, you are the better for it. So may the man be who takes my purse; but you will find out some day that the agriculturists are not in the habit of allowing their purse to be taken by any man who says he shall be the better for it. You say the manufacturers had a majority in the House of Commons, and so made the law which took it. And as foully they played for it. They first made a law to keep any man whose property was not vested in spinning-jennies, out of the House of Commons; and then they took the purse. They were shabby dogs, they were, those spinning-jenny fellows! but what was to be expected of men with no blood in their veins, not one of whom perhaps ever had a grandfather?

"Their object was, the protection of their own interests, and the protection and encouragement of the [manufacturing] labourers by public distribution of rewards for good conduct. He was enabled to congratulate them that the society was in a state of prosperity, which was not the case when it was first founded. They then united only to protect the [manufacturing] interest in that county and elsewhere, but it was high time then, as indeed it was high time now, to look at the [manufacturing] interest on every side on which it was assailed, for he could not too often repeat this truth, that on the prosperity of the [manufacturing] interests depended the prosperity of all the other interests of the country in which they lived (cheers)."—*Ibid.*

Your object you say, is the protection of the manufacturing labourer. That is, you wish to point out to the manufacturing labourer, that he is interested in preventing the agriculturists from selling their corn without a tax upon it, and so

engage him in support of the robbery. You want, in fact, to get the labourer to protect *you*. To which the answer is, first, that if he is an honest man he will not; and, secondly, that there is much to show him it is not for his interest to do it. Suppose manufactures *were* increased five-and-twenty years ago by laying a tax on home-grown corn, and that the manufacturing workmen of that day had all the advantages, in increase of wages or otherwise, that could arise from it;—are the manufacturing workmen of the present day the better for *that*, or have they done anything by cheating the agriculturists but secure themselves a worse supply of corn instead of a better, for five-and-twenty years and thenceforth for ever; and would not they be doing the part of wise men now, by giving up their fraud on the agriculturists by a little at a time, and so securing the benefits which finally come by honesty, without too strongly feeling the temporary sufferings from the change from wrong?

But the manufacturers say they "united only to protect the manufacturing interests;" that is, to protect the tax they had laid for the prevention of home-grown corn. And "it was high time then, as indeed it is high time now, to look at the manufacturing interest on every side on which it was assailed." Can they wonder at it? Was there not clearly an interest, composed of as good men as they, out of whose mouths all that was given to these knavish owners of spinning-jennies was manifestly taken? On what principle of human nature was it to be expected, that the agricultural interest were to sit down in silence, under the flagrant and undefended wrong thus put on them?

But it is *not* undefended. There is a defence; there is a reason. And the reason is, that it is impossible too often to repeat the truth, "that on the prosperity of the manufacturing interests depends the prosperity of all the other interests of the country."

Suppose, then, the manufacturers urging this, with all the gravity they could command. Would they be anything but laughed at for their pains? Suppose them saying to "Robert Seymour, of West Wickham, who has had born to him in lawful wedlock nine children, and brought up eight, without parochial relief," and is thereon rewarded with the first prize, £4,—or to "Charlotte Chamberlain, of the same fortunate locality, in the employ of Mr. Joseph Verey, 12 years, £3,"—whose names are recorded in the pages of the *Morning Herald;* suppose them saying to Robert or to Charlotte, "You know we have laid a tax upon your trade; you know

we did it to benefit ourselves, and you are vastly too sedate and well-informed persons not to know, that all which is good for us is good for you. Did you never hear the clergyman read in church, that all the members of the body were wonderfully fitted together, and when one member grieved, the others grieved with it? Now believe us, if we were to lose the tax upon your corn, we should grieve exceedingly; therefore there is scripture for it, and if you are not Chartists or Radicals you must believe, that you would grieve along with us. Is it not plain, that we, the manufacturers, make the great market for your corn, and that cutting off your market for what we do not want, makes us able to be so much better customers for the rest?" What would be the use of such a defence? Is there a Robert or a Charlotte in the country, who, without waiting for a reference to the parish clerk, would not expose it in a moment? Will then the noble Chairman cause to be pointed out, how it is that the robbery which would be so manifest an evil if committed by the manufacturers upon the agriculturists, becomes purged and good when the parties are to be reversed?

"If it had not been for these associations, probably the farmers would not have had the means of meeting so often as they had done their opponents in the field of discussion. They would have been behind others, who, to their injury, had taken a prominent lead in the country, and endeavoured to exasperate public opinion against them. It would be a pity if such persons had not been met; and the farmers were now, and ever would be, ready to meet them in defence of native industry and for the encouragement of native produce (cheers)."—*Ibid.*

Does not everybody see that this is a dispute between two parties, one of which has got the stolen purse? Suppose the manufacturers were found coming down to say, "We have got a tax on your home-grown corn, and now we come to discuss." And suppose they were heard complaining of the endeavours to exasperate public opinion against them, and representing their cause as the cause of native industry and for the encouragement of native produce. Would not the corn-growers reply, "Our corn, which you keep out of the market, is as much native produce and the result of native industry, as anything of yours. Why will you run the risk of what may come upon you in the end by plundering?"

"He looked forward with hope and anxiety to the period when the cultivator of the land would be allowed to pursue his toil in peace and quiet; and when the great question as to the

sources from whence food should be primarily obtained, which now agitated the country, should be finally and satisfactorily set at rest."—*Ibid.*

Suppose the worker of the mill was found longing for the time when he would be "allowed to pursue his toil in peace and quiet," with a robbery on the agriculturists in his pocket in the shape of a tax on home-grown corn; and when "the great question as to the sources whence food should be primarily obtained," should be satisfactorily set at rest by the confirmation of the fraud. Would he succeed in getting himself passed for anything but an individual at the lowest point of honesty, anxious to secure for himself the reputation of being at a point of intelligence to match?

"To this subject he would not further allude at present, only adding this one remark, that no one connected with the agricultural interest would ever consent to surrender one iota of his just rights (loud cheers)."—*Ibid.*

Suppose the manufacturers were found meeting in support of a five-and-twenty years' tax on home-grown corn, and declaring that no man connected with the manufacturing interest would ever consent to surrender one iota of his just rights. What would they be set down for, but dishonest men assembled to support a point-blank robbery by insolence? How came the agricultural interest born booted and spurred with "just rights" to ride over the manufacturer, and the manufacturer not have the same "rights" to use the boots and spurs when he can get them, to the extent of imposing a tax on home-grown corn for a countervailing period, subject to redemption by an equivalent tax on rent? The world or the honest part of it, exists only by the suppression of crime by punishment and by example; and to this, in the end, it will come.

Of the smaller leaders, it might be tedious to speak except in brief. Mr. Harcourt, M.P., thinks that a Mr. Jordan was wrong, "who said, that if the landlords of the country did not soon yield, there ought to be a madhouse built for them in every county." He thinks the madhouses should be tenanted by those who dream of escaping from the landlords' tax. Let us hope the time will come, when he will have an opportunity of answering his own arguments in the mouth of a manufacturer.

Mr. Dupré, M.P., "could not help contrasting the course pursued, with reference to the interests of agriculture, by the party with whom he acted, with that pursued by, he would call them, their most violent and unprincipled opponents. They who defended the cause of agriculture in the House of

Commons invariably spoke with all the calmness and deliberation of reason, without having recourse to wire-drawn theories and far-fetched speculation."

It is pleasant to hear of improvement; three years ago they howled like New Zealanders. But after all, what did they say? Did they say, we have got a prohibition on commerce to increase our rents, and we calmly and deliberately want to keep it? Or did they say, we beg you to reject the wire-drawn theory, that a man whose produce may not be sold is the worse for it, and to stick by the practical truth, that the man who puts half the difference into his pocket in the shape of rent, is the better? Bring it out, show it the day, let it be seen what this calmness produced, which could be turned to meet the inverted case of a manufacturer standing out for a tax on home-grown corn.

But "on the other side," these calm philosophers with a bread-tax in their pocket, "were met with personality and violence. Outside of the house, there was the same display on the part of their opponents. Itinerant agitators were sent round,—inflammatory pamphlets and placards were printed and distributed, with no other object than to excite the lower orders, and to create tumultuous agitation among the most worthless of the lower classes, who were most easily excited to turbulence."

And how much of this would the landowners leave undone, if the manufacturers had got a tax on home-grown food, rising and falling, by beautifully delicate gradations, with the variations in the price of corn? Where would they not agitate, that itinerancy could reach? What omit to inflame, that it was possible to set on fire? And by what argument should their opponents persuade themselves, that it was possible such conflagration could be stayed?

But, look on that picture and on this. "On the other side, the friends of agriculture acted purely on the defensive." Those who have another man's purse in their pockets ordinarily do. There are rare instances in which, on being brought into court, they address a penny-piece to the left eye of the sitting magistrate, or even dispense a shilling's worth at once for the benefit of the jury. But in the vast majority of cases, they systematically preserve the defensive; and the sufferer or his attornies as regularly display offensive qualities. There is something in the very nature of the position, which almost infallibly leads to this result. But the present parties act on the defensive, "confident in the rectitude of their intentions" to prohibit their neighbours' produce while they can, "and

in the justice of their cause" residing in their inborn right to tax a manufacturer's corn, and the inbred deficiency of right in a manufacturer to tax theirs in turn. If this is an unfair or invidious representation, show where it lies, by fitting the argument to the other side.

But there are further perils. "On their stability depended the stability of the Church and Constitution; and on their prosperity, though their opponents were not disposed to admit it, depended even the prosperity of the trading and manufacturing classes themselves." We understand it. The Church and Constitution are things made only to stand by the robbery of the manufacturing classes; and therefore it is, the manufacturing classes so zealously throw up their caps for Church and Constitution at Chartist meetings and elsewhere. And the connexion between the manufacturing and agricultural classes is so intimate, that it is for the interest of the one to let the other rob his till, provided always the robber be the agricultural. If this is not the thing that is true, it is at all events the thing we are told.

Hear more. "If they ever gave up the cause of protection to agriculture——England would at once sink into a second-rate power, and cease to be what she now was, the mistress of the seas, the arbitress of nations, and wonder of the civilized world (loud applause)."

Think of that, stupid manufacturers, and sea-calves that pass your lives in dragging from one side of the water to another the materials of what fools call commerce! England is maintained as a first-rate power, by wisely reducing her wealth and means to what can be fed upon the landlords' corn. If you brought more, it would be cutting down your country's strength; you must surely see how every grain would spread itself in some form of debility and woe, and the wonder of the civilized world be gone.

But there is one point, of another speaker, which must not be overlooked. Mr. C. B. Hamilton, M.P., asks—"Where is the man who, in the present aspect of affairs, would trust to the carrying trade for a supply of corn, and make us in England dependent on Europe for food?" This is a buffet, deserved by a nation which has for five-and-twenty years allowed its commerce to be stopped by Act of Parliament. Having submitted during peace, now comes the threat of proximity of war. But why not? Why not have the good market while we can, and take the landlords' when we can get no better? Or else why not at a peace prohibit commerce as a national danger, and say by Act of Parliament, Forasmuch as it is for

the safety of a nation to have nothing that can be cut off by war, Be it enacted &c. that all foreign commerce shall be against law? Is it not plain, in one case as in another, that all this making of commerce illegal lest war should come, is like a man's making his wife and children pass the night in the garden in their night-clothes, lest the house should get on fire? It may all be submitted to when the necessity arises; but, in the name of common sense let us wait till then. But you see how it is. They have lived on your exclusion from foreign commerce till they despair of keeping it up; so now they will try a war in aid.

Mr. R. Wheeler "returns thanks. The trade and institutions of Aylesbury derived great support from the farmers in the neighbourhood." Would not Mr. Wheeler have equally returned thanks, if the trade and institutions of his town of Aylesbury had been pitched by Providence in the neighbourhood of one of the old border communities that lived by stealing their neighbours' cows, and held cow-stealing to be the procreation of beef?

The noble Chairman declares Mr. Wheeler had spoken the truth. And his noble ancestor would have done the like, if he had chanced to rule the roast in the feudal community to whose neighbourhood Mr. Wheeler was supposed transferred.

The noble Chairman concludes—

"It had always been his desire and earnest wish that all classes should be allowed to live happily and in union together; and he did regret, from his heart, to see an anxious desire prevailing elsewhere to upset the interest of one great class of the country for the sole benefit of another. (Hear, hear.) It was not his wish that this attempt should be made without opposition, nor should it be unopposed. (Loud cheers.) He felt that all classes in this great and happy country ought to receive the benefit of equal laws, but he saw no reason why the farmers should be deprived of their rights and interests in order to serve the manufacturing classes.—That manufactures, trade, commerce, and agriculture might flourish in union together was his hope and wish, and, in his opinion, that hope would be realized were it not for the perpetual attempts of some persons to stir up mischief and sow the seeds of discord between them. (Hear, hear.)"—*Ibid.*

I see. The defence is, that the defendant was born with my purse in his pocket. If his were in mine, it would be an atrocious crime; but nature's just equilibrium, the point to which law and right tend of their own accord, is precisely this, that mine should be in his. How happily and in union

could we live together, had I been born with an equally vivid sentiment to the same effect! How from his heart does the defendant regret, to see an anxious desire prevailing elsewhere, —that is, in me—to overset the interest of one great class of the country in a robbery, for the sole benefit of another that is not to be robbed! He feels, that all classes in this great country ought to receive the benefit of equal laws,—the point of equality being what will give a tax with a sliding scale upon the manufacturers' corn. And he sees no reason why the farmers should be deprived of their "rights" in starting from such an equality, or their "interests" in preserving it; and for nothing but to serve the stocks and stones, who could not perceive their own interest in combining to set up and defend this grand standard of agricultural accuracy and disinterestedness. That manufactures, trade, commerce, and agriculture may flourish together, with the tax upon the former which is essential to a state of equality and perfect equilibrium, is still his hope and wish, and might, he thinks, be realized, were it not for the perpetual attempts of those who stir up mischief, and sow the seeds of discord among the sensitive farmers, by asking why a tax with a sliding scale upon their home-grown corn, would not do just as well.

Is there anything exaggerated in this representation? If there is, will you invite some of the lecturers in our itinerancy to sieve out the difference?

London, 28 *Sept.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXVIII.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW AND CARLYLE'S "CHARTISM."—THE CHURCH'S QUARREL WITH COMMERCE AND MANUFACTURES.—CAUTERY AND AMPUTATION FOR DISSENTERS.—RAZING HALF THE METROPOLIS.

SIR,—As you were pleased to give admission to two letters from me on the "Chartism" of Thomas Carlyle, you may possibly feel some interest in the demonstrations on the same subject, made on the part of the sect called the Established, in its organ the Quarterly Review, No. 132, just published.

In remarking on these, the object will be to show the nature of the power with which the public is grappling, and to point out the necessity and opportunity, for taking active measures in self-defence.

It might be superfluous to tell any man of literary habits and information, that the periodical work in question is the peculiar instrument of the active, the wide-awake, or as the

Americans would call it the "*go ahead*" portion of the Established Sect; and that it may consequently be considered as the point, and edge, for there are both, whose movements the eye of the threatened is particularly bound to follow. But as the attention of many of your readers has been engaged in other directions, it may not be amiss to give them notice of the fact.

Of course a warrior of the Establishment will begin by sneering at "philosophy," by which he means the efforts mankind has made to arrive at conclusions by the use of the reason God has given them.

'In one point of view, Mr. Carlyle's writings, and the partial popularity which they have obtained, are a striking symptom of the state of the times. No author of any school confesses more distinctly that for more than a century the English mind has been incapable of originating or appreciating any deep philosophy. Its whole vision, he avows, seems to have been obscured, and perverted to a singular obliquity. The only works professing a graver philosophy, which we can now put into the hands of young students, who wish to know what their immediate ancestors have thought on the weightiest questions respecting man, are those to which the really powerful intellects of Germany and France have pointed, the better with contempt, and the worse with triumph, as the source of most of the follies which subsequently inundated those countries. From these a man may learn that he is made of five senses, and little more; that he is to think for himself, without listening to others; that he is not responsible to man, and consequently not to God, for his opinions, nor, therefore, for his actions; that his whole intellectual power is merely a machine for grinding logic; that it is his right and duty to govern himself, and not to be governed by others; that societies are joint-stock companies for taking care of man's body, leaving his soul to take care of itself; that whatever he thinks and feels is right; that whatever he deems profitable is also good; that his mind may be anatomised and studied as a skeleton in a glass-case, and all its faculties and organs injected and laid out—and that with this, and this alone, we may thoroughly understand it; that it is every man's business to take care of himself; that it is our duty to see the whole of everything; that whatever we cannot see, and force into a syllogism, is false; that mystery is another word for falsehood; that religion is little more than priestcraft; that men can find, and did find it out, at the beginning, by the light of their own understanding; that if religion is to be maintained it should be excluded at least from the ordinary pursuits and speculations of life, and placed in quarantine, as if its very breath would infect the independence and value of truth; that prudent practice has no connexion with profound theory; and that in a world of railroads and steam-boats, printing-presses, and spinning-jennies, deep thinking is quite out of place.'—*Quarterly Review, No. CXXXII.* p. 446.

This accumulation of bravadoes is not inserted to be answered point by point; because happily there is nothing calling itself Chartist, Socialist, or anything else of like heterodox termination, that (without at all vouching for its perfection in extreme cases) will not be able to go through the most of this, with a running commentary greatly to the edification of those concerned. But it is given as the shortest way of setting your readers at ease, as to the manner of man they have to deal with, and the manner of church he is going to defend.

The first attack is upon Parliaments.

'It is not, be assured, in parliament, as parliament, to remedy any national evil, deep-seated in the habits and practices of the people. They are a drag upon the wheels of absolute power—they may be the right and necessary drag;—but when they come to lead, and govern, and perform the high functions of a soul in the body politic, they find, and we shall find too, that the whole machine stands still, or flies to pieces with a crash. You cannot govern by numbers—you cannot preserve, or defend, or improve, or act in any way as a reasoning governor for the benefit of reasonable subjects, without unity and consistency, and permanence in your principles and plans. Change the soul of a man every ten minutes, and then put his acts and thoughts together, and try to frame them into a system—what do they become but madness? And attempt to govern by a body, in which the majority may shift twenty times during the discussion of one measure, which varies with every breeze of popular feeling, which cannot pledge either itself or its successor to any one definite line of action, and what does your government become but madness?'—*Id.* p. 461.

The old flag of absolutism, which it might be well enough to hoist two centuries ago, but is all too late now. Who is to be "the reasoning governor," and how is he to be settled? Is he to come from Sardinia, Hanover, or Canterbury? Which of these is worthiest to "perform the high functions of a soul in the body politic"? We want *Mon Oncle Thomas* to be "grand regulator;" but who shall settle, among the candidates for "grand regulator"? Two hundred years ago, we had a grand regulator hoisting his standard at Nottingham. But nothing that has intervened, appears encouraging for starting him again.

One quotation more, may settle the political creed of the enemy you are at issue with.

'A representative, democratical government, resting really, and directly, and exclusively, on the will of the people, (O! strange contradiction to be uttered by an enlightened century!) is not made to move. It was never intended for it. It was constructed to prevent other powers from moving; and for this it will work admirably. Its motto is

'*Laissez faire*:' Do nothing, attempt nothing. Let every one take care of himself. Its very life and essence depends on inactivity. It must yield to every pressure from without, abandon every notion of resistance, or it will be destroyed. Activity is independence. A parliament democratically constructed has abdicated independence; and a ministry dependent on a majority in such a parliament, and a monarch who can act only through such a ministry, are virtually nothing. They are puppets and machines. And who would ask a puppet or machine, moved about by the whims and caprices of a people, to stand boldly forward and cure, by cautery or amputation, or any other painful process, (all cures of great diseases must be painful) the sickness which that same people have brought on themselves by their own follies and sins? It is a contradiction in terms.'—*Id.* p. 462.

This is plain enough for the politics of the matter. A representative democratical government, stands between us and "cautery or amputation" for our "follies and sins." And the sect we pay for whether we will or no, is longing to be "neighbour Dominick with his tongs red hot, d'ye hear?" In short, the Church is reaching over the water, to see what there may be there, to aid its chance of establishing the theocracy it longs for.

But where there is so much love, there must be some hate; where there is so much desire avowed, there must be some disclosure of the points from which opposition is dreaded. And what are the objects of the Church's hate and fear; the Mordecais in its eyes, whose existence troubles and alarms it? Simply, *commerce and manufactures*, and the classes that live thereby. It is the same feud which arose between the power of the Roman pontiff, and the commercial and manufacturing communities of continental Europe, and which those communities wisely settled by throwing off the pontiff's yoke and confessing Protestantism. And the same evil must have the same cure. The attack is not of our making, but the defence must be. A despotic church, not scrupling in its undisguised moments to avow itself the heir of Rome, or rather the real Simon Peter where the Roman was but the sham,—is upon us again, and roaring for the destruction of our liberties civil, religious, and industrial. Perhaps this is exaggerated. Read and see. And first, of the sins for which we are to suffer "cautery or amputation."

'If it be asked what those sins are, we shall not be content, like Mr. Carlyle, to speak of *exploded formalisms*, of *the growth of society*, of *mysterious accidents in nature* which gave birth to an Arkwright and a Watt, and converted a plain, unlettered, but not unhappy or unrighteous peasantry, into the fermenting poisoned masses of Birmingham and Manchester [*Why was your Leeds omitted?*]. What was it that emptied of their

spirit those old forms on which Society once rested? What was it that turned the living majestic figures of a Monarchy and a Church, before which the people worshipped with a willing, and free, and holy worship, into skeletons and scarecrows? What has hurried on Society into this downward fearful career of degradation, and brought upon us this appalling curse of a demoralized, licentious, unchristian, socialist, chartist, thuggist, manufacturing population, swelling like a wen every day, and eating like a cancer into the heart of this great country? These are the questions which Mr. Carlyle proposes to answer, but has not answered.'—*Id.* p. 463.

See how the Church abhors you, how it curses you by its gods. Can there come forth no knowing Chartist now, to advise you to be careful how you touch the interest she holds in taxes on your bread, and above all things to ware "*revolution*,"—aye "*revolution*,"—which would follow on your ceasing to maintain your foes? In one sense it is true enough; for what revolution could be greater, than that men who had not genius to know their enemies when they paid for them, should stand up in government and in religion free.

But to the sins, for which "cautery or amputation" are promised us if we are good.

'It was first of all the spirit of *dissent*. Long before Dissent assumed its name, a name which Christians of old, even the most free and most presumptuous, would have denounced as self-condemnation, the spirit was working within the church. It made men slight antiquity, fight against the authority of the civil power, trifle with positive institutions, trust to themselves, to their own arm and their own understanding. It professed to explain everything. It allowed of no mysteries. It thought more of rousing men's feelings and governing their minds, than of simply enunciating truth committed to their keeping by God. It engendered factions; brought together turbulent men in different countries, and formed everywhere a nucleus of rebellion against lawful sovereigns. It taught men to fight against law, under pretence of reason and conscience, in order to save their money; to revenge themselves against forced insult; to shake off, as they call it, a dominant power, and establish their own power instead. And in this way it produced Popery. Popery, as distinguished from Catholicism, is nothing but this; and Popery killed Christianity. It provoked hatred and contempt for ministers of God, who showed themselves to be his ministers only in the name; and the Church sank into a formula, such as Mr. Carlyle deplores and condemns—a form without a spirit. Then came the sacrileges of the State. Instead of preserving the forms of this corrupt church, and breathing into them a new life, Henry VIII. and the parliament of his day thought with Mr. Carlyle, and acted as he prophesies and recommends. They also were for realities. They hated 'shows,' 'cant,' 'formulas,' 'speciosities,' 'quacks,' 'incarnate falsehoods.' They made no distinction between things which God had designed for good, and man only had rendered useless, and things which God himself

would reprobate and destroy. Animation was suspended; they mistook it for death, and killed the patient because he had fainted.'—*Id.* p. 463.

'Alas! for the man who attempts this [to restore the truth], with the utmost 'clearness of heart,' with the most 'holy zeal.' There can be but one truth, one goodness, one happiness; and these can but embody themselves in *some one form or set of forms.* And when the forms remain after the spirit has departed, he who would invent new forms with a new spirit in them, instead of retaining the old and bringing the old spirit back into them, must be establishing a lie. So the new forms of dissent were invented—not always without 'clearness of heart'—not always without 'holy zeal'—in some cases 'gently and almost with pity'—to supersede the old and lifeless forms (we do not say of Popery, for these men were bound to destroy) but of true Catholic Christianity. So when government became corrupt, and Monarchy with its council of nobles, and its petitioners for the redress of grievances, in the person of a House of Commons, had lost its soul and spirit in the eyes of the people, Revolutionists invented a new form of constitution, to embody what they deemed the true spirit of liberty and government. And how has it ended? Dissent has become a denial of all truth, and a parliamentary constitution the denial of all government. We have the forms of lies and the lies themselves; and now are beginning to feel that it had been better to have preserved the forms of truth, even without the truth, and to have waited patiently and obediently, and with hope in God, until He, the only source of any true inspiration, should be pleased to breathe into them again the breath of life.'

'And now we may look back upon the deeds of avarice, and violence, and sacrilege, with which Henry VIII. and Edward VI. and Elizabeth disgraced a holy Reformation; sweeping away not only the rubbish of Popery but abused institutions of Catholicism, under the pretence of *abolishing forms.* We cannot thank God too fervently that more was not destroyed—that so much was left standing within which truth and piety may still find a shelter—and hope to rebuild the remainder upon old foundations.'—*Id.* p. 465.

With matter such as this, the object is not to comment, but to disperse. Can any one doubt, that here is the Church throwing off the mask, and moving back again to its position at the accession of Henry VIII? The cautious and timid will lie by; the Archbishop of Canterbury has not put his name to it, and probably will not; but here is the *Plantaleone*, the standard-bearer of the church moving forward with his holy rag, and the rest looking on to see what comes of the adventure.

The organ ecclesiastic applies itself to Mr. Carlyle's proposed remedies.—

'——— Reading and emigration!'

'Consider for one moment. How has this curse been propagated?—How have the wretched thousands of Birmingham and Manchester been engendered and huddled up in those abodes of misery and vice? *By a*

reading, instructed, enlightened, scientific body of manufacturers. How have those unhappy slaves to the avarice of their masters been enabled to do their will? By their own quickened intelligence and acuteness. Go into the factories, and ask how few are unable to read and write—how few at least among the parents, though these reading parents may have sold their children to a drudgery which precludes them from attending schools? What are your Mechanics' Institutes, your Penny Magazines, your Penny Satirists, your loathsome sheets of popular blasphemy and profligacy, well written, clever, intelligent, often even scientific, which meet you in the street at every turn, but a proclamation of the triumph of the alphabet?'—*Id.* p. 496.

The cure for all is to be, "religious men." Of what religion? Of course the "grand regulator's." We have him here directly.

'Give a religious man to lead the world, and there will be a true object for man's reverence, a fit centre for his love; round this will gather all the good, warm affections of the nation; with this will come obedience, with obedience unity, with unity strength and wisdom, with wisdom self-restraint, with self-restraint all other checks upon that inordinate cupidity, which has made England a manufacturing pandemonium, and on that thoughtless, heartless extravagance, which has left Ireland to be overrun by starving beggars.'—*Id.* p. 497.

Mr. Carlyle's other remedy, Emigration, may be the landlords' safety-valve; but the Church prefers trying the strength of the boiler.

'Before emigration is tried, let us endeavour to occupy our own waste lands. [*That is to say let foreign commerce be further cut down, in order that the price of bread may rise to what will give the landlords rent from a flagged floor.*] Millions of acres are still unreclaimed, both in Great Britain and Ireland. Stop the gambling speculation of our manufactures [*Let the Messrs. Marshall look to it*], and drain off the surplus population from our towns into the country. Let landlords plant colonies on their commons, and bogs, and mountains [*taking enforced rent for the same*]; plant them under their own eye, upon right principles of colonization, in organic bodies, with powers of self-government; with social privileges; with the germs of village institutions, especially with that first principle of social life and organization, an efficient ecclesiastical establishment in the centre. Restore something of the feudal spirit into our tenure of land. Raze, if you like, to the ground half an overgrown metropolis, and all the idle, gossipping, gaping watering-places, where those men who ought to be each in their own parishes, ruling their estates as the representatives of the great Estate, the Monarchy of the realm, are frittering away time, and money, and dignity, and intellect, in frivolous dissipations. If we are so fond of ruling—and ruling is, indeed, one of our noblest duties—let us rule each in our own appointed sphere. That passion which is now so common, of governing the country, while we neglect our tenants, is at least suspicious. Let each man take care of his own part, and the

whole will take care of itself. But without a landlord in every part of the empire, exercising faithfully, and earnestly, and affectionately, the duties of a little monarch, and so carrying into the minutest details, from day to day, the principles of a paternal government, the best laws and wisest legislators, sitting as abstractions in the senate, will only be a mockery. Then give to every landlord the best of coadjutors, appointed for him by God, a good religious clergyman [*Don Carlos or Miguel would boggle at the coadjutor*]; and let the church draw out her own organization and machinery to meet the wants of the crisis, and rouse herself to fight her battles with firmness, and zeal, and depth of thought, and of learning, without either compromise or intolerance—let all this be done, as it may be done, if each man will do his duty, in his own family and his own heart, and we may yet live. These are the only cures for our evils, the only answer to Mr. Carlyle's question on the condition of England.'—*Id.* p. 501.

Here is " the intent of tyranny avow'd;" and we are to wait and see it march over us body and soul, unless the Chartists in the mean time carry Universal Suffrage. But all men have not such notions of action; and some of us will be up and doing like our forefathers. It must be met; being stricken we must strike again. Liberty of all kinds was always an armed heresy; and the Church has given us our clear call to be forthcoming with a " New Protestantism." The working classes are evidently on the slip for something of the kind, and feeling if haply they may find something in which they may unite. The time is promising, and any man has a right to try his hand, and say his say.

The trial shall be made in my next; and in the mean time let our friends weigh the necessity, and spread the knowledge of the case.

London, 30 *Sept.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Bolton Free Press.

No. II.

" HINTS FOR THE HUSTINGS."—NOT A WORD ON TORY DISLOYALTY.—THE CANADAS.—ON THE CORN LAWS, PUT ALWAYS THE CONVERSE CASE.—IRELAND.—CHARTISM.

SIR,—Our useful friend Blackwood has put forth what he denominates " Hints for the Hustings;" and because they were prosy as was in the nature of prose, he has done us the favour of exhibiting the pith of them in his last number in rhyme. So that between the two, there may be some chance of making them the text for providing an answer against the threatened day, when our side is to " bellow for grace."

In the first place, we are to be horribly dealt with if we say anything of " TORY DISLOYALTY;" meaning the outbreaks

of Tory orators against that particular branch of the existing government, the monarchical, which Tories in their holiday dresses profess to take under their special care and protection. And the argument with which we are to be primarily overwhelmed, is conveyed in that "shorter catechism" with which we are favoured in verse, by the following irresistible line,—

"First simply assert that the charge is *a lie*."

The best preparation for resistance to this doughty argument, would be to read on the hustings the depositions of the Conservative newspapers, with the addition of "which Blackwood simply asserts is a lie." Like everything else, it is a matter for evidence. Give fair play to both sides, and especially hear anything that may be advanced by the opponents. *Your* policy is, to benefit by exactly so much as may stick after all.

On the threatened "hint at Denman and Brough'm, at the Duke and the Prince,"—or even if the enemy should "lastly allude to a speech by old Coke,"—the best way of meeting such a shock would probably be, by crying "tell, tell," and inveigling the opponent, if he has anything to say on those subjects, into the necessity of saying it himself, under the fire of such comments as the wit of a hustings audience may bestow upon him.

If "on the CANADAS next they should largely dilate, in extent so prodigious, in value so great;"—ask them what is the use of a shop, though ever so "prodigious," where the trade carried on consists in cutting boots into shoes. For to this in the main do the Canadas come; being a shop for supplying the British public with bad timber at a dear rate, through the intervention of stopping the importation of better timber at a cheaper rate, for the benefit of certain individuals who by parliamentary influence can secure the privilege of engaging their capital in the process.

"Such an outlet for industry—idle at home—Such a fountain of commerce through ages to come." So sings the bard of the shoe-shop. "We keep a poet," may be said by the cutter of boots into shoes, as well as by the honest blacking-man. The "idle at home" too, being "idle" because it suits another monopoly to prohibit foreign commerce at large by Act of Parliament! "Whether traitor or trimmer confusion to *him*, Who would cripple the realm in so goodly a limb." Shall we get anybody on our side, do you think, to venture himself upon the hustings?

"If firebrands or fools of *self-government* speak, Say, 'tis nonsense and knavery all that they seek." In doggerel of this kind the blacking-poets of knaves and tyrants have sung against *self-government* from the beginning of the contest.

And then comes a reference to the trumpery absurdity passing under the name of parental government. The Canadians who want *self-government* are babies, and their papas who butcher them with hired soldiers, are the proper judges of what is good for the nursery. Some people thought the American infants had solved that fallacy once for all.

"At the CORN LAWS, though now rather musty and stale,
If some *flow'ry* Whig orator chuses to rail, Don't be you *mealy-mouth'd*, give him prices and freight, and just press him to death on the subject of weight." The "poet" has got something into his head about *weight;* which on reference to the prose version, appears to be connected with the not impossible fact, that foreign wheat is lighter than English. Suppose it is, what bearing has that upon the question whether trade shall be allowed in foreign wheat? Fancy the day come, when the manufacturers shall have a tax (if not redeemed by an equivalent tax on rent) on home-grown corn; and see how far the corn-growers will allow themselves to be "pressed to death on the subject of weight." Try to quiet them with an assurance that there are differences of weight between English and foreign corn; and see how much they will admit this has to do with the question.

And here is let out the great and general parry to all that is advanced in support of the Corn Laws. Always parody the argument, by supposing it applied to a tax on home-grown corn. For example, take the notable dilemma on which the Blackwood poet plumes himself.—

"When prices decline, pray will wages fall too?
"(We've an answer *in petto* to meet either view:).
"If they *won't*, what relief will the *masters* have then?
"If they *will*, what the mischief becomes of the *men*?"

Now put the case that the manufacturers were advancing such an argument to persuade the agriculturists to agree to a tax on home-grown corn. "If the tax was taken off, would the condition of the agricultural labourers be bettered, or in other words, their substantial wages rise? If they won't, what relief will the *masters* have then? If they will, what the mischief becomes of the *men*?" Fancy, I say, this much worse than babyish argument, put to well-grown agriculturists, and see how soon, after the *guffaws* which such silliness would excite, they would reply that they expected to benefit *both masters and men at once*, and were not to be cheated by this naked attempt to sacrifice the interest of both by setting off one against the other. And if the manufacturers' mountebank should follow this up by suggesting, that if "the two parties should divide the fancied difference there would be so little left

for either, as would be below the button-top," what earthly chance would there be that the agriculturists would yield to this? Remember then, that when we risk ourselves upon the hustings, we always retort with the tax on home-grown corn.

But, not to stop exactly here because the opponent does, suppose we go a little farther, and point out what desperate and unmanageable nonsense it would be, for the manufacturers to set about trying to represent to the agriculturists, that all that was concerned in the tax on home-grown corn was a little more or less of wages and profits, in which it was utterly unworthy of the agriculturists either to raise a difficulty, or to think (in the expressive language of Blackwood) of "making two bites of a cherry." Let the agriculturists tell their own story, of what the worth of this "cherry" would be like. Their first discovery then would be, that the owners of capital vested in land, were cut off from the use and benefit of all those portions of land, which could be profitably cultivated under a state of freedom, and could not be profitably cultivated after the tax was imposed; and further, that they would be cut off from the application of all those portions of monied capital, which could have been profitably laid out in improving the cultivation of various kinds of land under a state of free sale for the produce, and could not when the produce was to pay a tax,—the last *doses*, in the phrase of some political economists, which could be applied wth a profit; and that all these stoppages and cuttings-short, though encountered in the first instance by the farmers who are the actual cultivators, must in the main, or with deduction of the portions of the loss which might stick by the farmers and their labourers, be deducted from the rents. In short they would have a most clear perception, that the act so far as it was not professed to be of the nature of retribution for previous damage done to their neighbours, was a simple confiscation of a calculable portion of their land or of the capital invested in it.

And next would come the noisy army of the farmers, shouting louder than ever they did for Corn Laws, that the trade and business of a farmer was cut down and reduced, in exact proportion to the land so virtually confiscated or annihilated. They would exclaim, that the competition for farms was increased, the difficulty of establishing their children in their own mode of life augmented, and that in every way they had just cause to pray, that the manufacturing knaves who had wrought their woe, should forthwith be sent to try their hands in Botany Bay, or other fit receptacle for so much villainy.

And lastly would come the chaw-bacon battalions, swearing, and with perfect right, that they were crammed into the

poor-house to please the manufacturing varlets; and praying that they might be allowed to marshal themselves with stake and pitch-fork, to try a "tussle" with their mill-working oppressors. What bawling, what loyalty, what calling on Queen and nobles to mount on horseback and lead the "Royal Agricultural" crusade against such jenny-spinning impudence!

It would be plain then, that the agriculturists were contending, not for some paltry difference of prices which might or might not be compensated to them in some other way,—nor for anything like "two bites of a cherry" to be divided between the landed capitalists and those in their employ; but for the preservation or confiscation of a substantial fraction of the landed property of the country, and of all the subordinate interests which might be found involved. And just so do the manufacturers contend, against the confiscation and annihilation of a substantial fraction of the commercial and industrial wealth of the country, and all the evils consequent to the subordinate interests concerned. The man who should maintain that either of the contesting parties struggled for a light thing, or for one that might be neglected and set aside, would be too great a fool to be a knave; the innocence of his heart would be vouched for, by the weakness of his head.

And suppose again the manufacturers at a parley were to propound, that what they had got, they ought to keep; and that by removing the tax on home-grown corn, it was quite manifest that if the agriculturists gained, the manufacturers would lose, and therefore it was contrary to the rules of morality for the manufacturers to hear of giving up their "rights," and in short no manufacturer would ever think of it. Would the agriculturists be an hour without finding out, that this was all contending for preserving the calling of a thief,—an outcry against that species of confiscation which consists in turning a highwayman off the road he has set his fancy on? *He* confiscates, who takes another man's property by a dishonest tax. The point of honesty, which is letting other men alone, is always what draws the line between the thief and the thief-taker.

One point more. Suppose the manufacturers to set up the plea, that they the manufacturers, in the exercise of the power they had obtained in the House of Commons by passing a law to keep other people out, had laid taxation so heavily upon themselves and their own interests, as to induce an absolute necessity for their laying a tax on home-grown corn to bring things to something like fairness and equality. Would not the agriculturists, with all the world at their backs, break out against this as too monstrous, gross and palpable, for belief in

the weakest ages of human intellect? Was anything like it ever seen, heard of, or whispered? Can any example be produced, or any shadow looking as if an example was somewhere else, of a similar proceeding on the part of any aggregated human beings? There are grossnesses of hypocrisy, foulnesses of interested pretension, which must be seen to be believed, and on which it is useless to be sceptical, for the single reason that the instance is at our doors.

Again then, to our hustings friends, *Insist on the converse case.* Try their mummery always with the cold steel of changing places with the demanders. Let nobody lead you by the nose, before he has established to your full conviction and his own, that he would be a fool if he resisted, when you the man were astride of the lion instead of the lion being astride of the man.

Next, for IRELAND. If you are troubled on that head, begin by thanking the "Arch-Agitator" for the light he has thrown on the advantages which might arise to the peaceful and honest portion of the English community, from any increase of independence on the part of Ireland, which might tend to split and divide the incubus that under divers names of mock patriotism and mock virtue is the common enemy. And if this is not enough,—if you are forced on it unwillingly by the perseverance of the opponent,—proceed to ask the "Agitator" whether after all, his Repeal is the most effectual way, or the most likely to be carried; and whether if Irishmen and Englishmen could cease bullying each other with "three hundred thousand men," and act in concert, it might not be in human wisdom to lay the foundations in peace and harmony, for what should much more effectually promote the co-operation for good and the check for evil. Touch this point; come near the sore place; and see whether you are much disturbed on the question of Ireland.

Lastly, CHARTISM. You are dared to produce "a specific case of evil that can be shown to arise out of our vicious laws or vicious opinions." Give them one word of O'Connell again; or if you are particular, call it two. Utter "Slave-Class." Does *that* arise out of "vicious laws or vicious opinions?" If after asking this, your opponent insists on going on, you must do as Mrs. Glass would, if after having "caught her carp" it leaped out of the frying-pan. But there are considerable chances, that after being brought to this point, your carp will be resigned.

It is now some years since I ventured to be grateful for the great service done by Blackwood every now and then to the liberal cause. I shall be glad if you think the present another case in point.

P.S. Oct. 8.—Public affairs have taken a turn since I wrote, which almost supersedes the use of speculation on our former subject. There is to be no freedom of trade, because, as far as war can hinder it, there is to be no more trade. The Ministers have determined on a general war; for which I am afraid no reason can be given but a desire to stop the agitation for reform and free trade in England, and for repeal in Ireland. The alarm here is great; but you will hear as little as possible of it from the London papers, for they are all in the hands of those who are opposed to it. Mohammed Ali is to be attacked in the interest of Russia, who will equally gain whether he is destroyed by the Holy Alliance, or the two parties of Turks cut one another's throats. And in return for this service, Russia is to help to depress the French. Whigs are going about saying, that "*this time* they will partition France." France, meantime, does not intend to be partitioned; and the last thing I heard, is that the French goverment has intimated to the leading Poles in Paris, that they may soon be wanted. Lord Palmerston is understood to have invited the Russian fleet in the Black Sea to pass the Dardanelles and come into the Mediterranean, and the Russian Baltic fleet is believed to be on its way to the same destination; the object being to out-number and destroy the French fleet in that sea. There is but one chance left; which is to unite in calling for the immediate assembling of parliament. The plan appears to be to get us into a war while there is no House of Commons, and then tell us there is nothing to be done but go on.

London, Oct. 5, 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXIX.

THE NEW PROTESTANTISM.—WHAT IT PROTESTS AGAINST.—VISIBLE MARKS OF FRAUD.—WHY THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IS A "SECT."—NOT "DISSENT," BUT "PROTEST," IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.—IMPORTANCE OF EXCLUDING THE ESTABLISHED SECT FROM INTERMEDDLING WITH CIVIL RIGHTS AND CEREMONIES OF OTHERS.—WAR TO STOP REFORM AND REPEAL.

SIR,—In my last letter to you I endeavoured to show, that the Established Sect or the active part of it having thrown off the mask, and avowed its return to the claims and practices which induced our forefathers to cast off the domination of the Church of Rome, the time was come when it behoved all who were not prepared for submission to the resurrection of the ancient

tyranny, to unite in meeting the New Papacy, with what may properly enough be denominated a "New Protestantism." I am now therefore to set down some of the ways in which this might be brought about.

And here then it is plain, that we must not meet offence with offence, nor bigotry with bigotry. The thing may have been tried in the olden time; but it must be a totally different course that will answer now. Our business must be to include the greatest number. Like Simon Peter and his ship's company, we must cast the net for all sorts, and if we find it "full of great fishes, an hundred and fifty and three," we must go to dinner with increased thankfulness for the success that has been vouchsafed us. Our two mottoes in fact must be, "He that is not against us is on our part," and "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

What then are the points in which the assumers of such a title as "New Protestants," agree?

They agree in one only;—in "protesting."

What do they protest against?

First, They protest against the divine procession of the Church of England.

Secondly, They protest against her power over the persons and purses of men.

Thirdly, They protest against her abuse of power of all kinds, to the injury of civil and religious liberty, and the maintenance of ignorance and crime.

What dost thou mean by the divine procession of the Church of England?

I mean the doctrine and assertion that "God hath set some in the church," and *that they of the Church of England are they.*

Why dost thou disbelieve this?

First, generally; Because this only amounts to saying, "I think myself the true, therefore I *am* the true." There are a thousand-and-one sects more, that say the same. And because it cannot be true of all, such a mode of reasoning is not to be believed for any.

Secondly, particularly; Because the constitution and discipline of the Church of England, are not only not in accordance with the written rule on which they are professed to be founded, but bear visible marks of fraud intended to conceal their contrariety thereto.

What dost thou mean by fraud?

I mean that the word "Bishop," which is the groundwork of the Church of England's claim, is a fraudulent fabrication, or coining of a word, from a tongue unknown to the vulgar, with

the intent of affixing the unknown term to something totally opposite to its meaning in the language from which it was taken and in the places where it is found used, and thereby imposing on the vulgar the belief, that the scriptures authorize and acknowledge something directly contrary to what they actually contain.

Explain your meaning further.

The discipline of the early "churches" or societies of Christians in particular cities or places, is recorded to have been carried on by means of numerous elders, appointed by the head of the society in each place, who seems to have been himself appointed, at least in places of importance, directly by the apostles, and to have been selected for personal qualities, in some cases a youth, but possessing it must be supposed the knowledge and talents deemed necessary for the office. In these respects, there seems to have been considerable resemblance to the non-commissioned and commissioned officers of an army; the elders representing the first. And there are found required of them accordingly, the virtues of non-commissioned officers; they are to be "blameless, the husband of one wife [Christians in those days lay under a temptation to have two], having faithful children [that is, whom they had brought up as Christians], not accused of riot or unruly." And the reason given is, that men who are to be "overseers" of others, must be "blameless, &c." And the same men are sometimes called "overseers," without the word "elders." But the plainest of all things is, that they were at the bottom of the ladder and not at the top. Now see what is done. The Greek for "overseer" happens to be "*episcopos*." And out of this Greek word have been coined in the various languages of Europe and Asia, by the processes of cutting off a letter here and altering another there, the terms *vescovo, évêque, uskoff, bischoff, bishop;* all with the same intent, of imposing on the vulgar the belief, that one man had a right divine to rule under that name with huge revenues and be called "my lord," because a score of Christian corporals were in Greek *episcopos*. And as the means of carrying out the design, in all the places (except one where it was too dangerous) that the word "overseer" or "overseership" occurs in the original, the translation was falsified to suit.

This is what *you* think true. But may not other people, as you said, think the contrary?

Facts may be contested, though not opinions. Facts are the roots of opinions. We stand on facts, like the Protestants that went before us. We appeal to the written books, whether

certain words are there or not; and to human learning and intelligence, whether those words mean certain things. If anybody thinks after all, that Timothy's elders were bishops, we cannot help it. We will not put him in prison with John Thorogood. We only want John Thorogood out.

What do you mean by her power over the persons and purses of men?

I mean her power *to* take money for her purposes from other sects, and imprison the bodies of such as refuse; while those other sects have not the power to take money from her members in turn, and to imprison the bodies of such as decline payment.

What do you mean by her abuse of power of all kinds?

I mean the employment of influence and power in general, distinct from the particular power over bodies and goods before mentioned; to the production of evil to the community, and not of good.

What do you mean by injury to civil and religious liberty?

I mean that all her leanings have been towards slavery and abuse, except where she happened to be attacked herself.

What do you mean by the maintenance of ignorance and crime?

She makes herself the great obstacle to education, unless she is allowed to imbue men from their childhood with "conscientious slavery." And ignorance is the mother of crime.

Is she not the National Church?

No, she is the Non-National. You might as well talk of the National humpbacks. You cannot make the humpbacks the Nation.

Why do you call her a Sect?

I find it in Euclid. It is written there, "A Segment of a "circle is the figure contained by a straight line and the cir-"cumference it cuts off." There is nothing about one of the parts being a Segment, more or less than the other. Anything that is not the whole, is a Segment.

It appears then we make "protest," and why. And next how men may be joined in it. The main road to this end, then, must be a spirit of *catholicity*; the same spirit which is indicated in the first of the mottoes recommended. We must remember that we are not men combining with a view to finally bringing the mass to an accordance on any assignable point or points of religious belief; but men seeking for mutual protection against a common tyranny. We are content that other men's creeds be free, provided our own is; we care nothing about the hue and features of what others may chuse to dandle,

so that our own feelings are saved from seeing the wolf "whose gospel is his maw," disturbing the nurselings of our own hearts' attachment. When two walk under an umbrella, they must sink religious differences. When multitudes are to unite to prevent themselves from being dragooned into the "establish'd pea-green slipper," the necessary consequence is an understanding among themselves, that every man shall wear any kind of "high-lows" he pleases. The organization to be desired is, what shall leave all at liberty to march against the common enemy, shod after any sort they chuse.

In aid of such a plan, it would be desirable that as many as possible, and especially all levies to be hereafter raised, should eschew the barren, fizenless, lean negative, "Dissenter;" and assume the bolder and more intelligible term of "Protestant." As the *Quarterly Review* justly hints, there was no such term as "Dissent" recognized in the early churches; but there was no lack of objects to "protest" against, in the shape of man, woman, or beast, which were to trouble these latter times on which we have fallen.

Another great point would be, to take a just advantage of the degree of liberty with which we have already been made free. Half a century ago, it was matter of complaint, that a man could neither be born, nor buried, nor legally joined to the woman of his choice, without the impertinent interference of the priesthood. Now this is to a great extent altered; but comparatively little advantage has been taken of the fact. The women of England complain, and rightly, that they do not hold the position in society they ought. Here then is a department for them, in which they might promote the advancement of society in general, which implies their own. The marriage service of the Established Sect is notoriously so coarse, so contrary to all that a father, a brother, or a lover, would think of summoning the object of his interest to hear from him, that the better-minded portion of the clergy of the establishment do not read it in its entireness before persons they respect. I never was married but once, and do not want to be. But I perfectly recollect that the clergyman, seeing us decent kind of people, cut short the service extensively; and I felt obliged to him. As this was thirty years ago, it can hardly be ascribed to new-fangled notions; and, though some of the gazettes of the tyranny have lately been intimating that such excisions might affect the legality of marriages, I doubt whether there is much chance of oversetting the marriages of the last thirty years at St. Andrew's Holborn, for an ancient clergyman's instinct of propriety. But what I want to re-

mark is, that I have not heard of any woman, *declaring off* from the premeditated coarseness of the Establishment. From some prejudice or other, they had all rather undergo the Church's rudeness. One reason in aid probably is, that even the Dissenters, since the increased liberty, have not had the tact to know, that all unnecessary forms and manipulations in the matter of marriage, are only blowing the trumpet before what nature intended to be concealed, and are all founded, more or less, on a principle like what takes people to witness executions, the desire to see how an individual, in this case probably a young and beautiful woman, will behave in circumstances which must at all events be novel. The true mark for civilization to aim at, and the approach to which is one of the best measures of the departure from barbarism and brutality, is that marriages should be substantiated by as effectual a document under the signature of parties and witnesses as would be competent by law to the transfer of landed property, and there have done.

A principal object therefore for all societies desiring to come under the title of "New Protestants," would be that they should exclude the established sect from all intermeddling with their civil rights and ceremonies. Decent women, might consent to marry without running the gauntlet of the *tawdry* they must hear from a stall-fed churchman and a leering clerk. And in all other ways, the modern Protestants should take advantage of the religious liberties bequeathed them by their ancestors. It has been the business of modern bigots to cut these down; and diamond should cut diamond. My father, bold and fearless, and who would have doubly enjoyed heaven if he could have been sent there as a martyr to the religious freedom of his own sect, used, I remember well, to boast that no magistrate could refuse a license for a place of worship or to preach. "Let *him* see the man, who would ask him a question, when he proffered his half-crown!" But the cunning of the adversary has got beyond the ancient simplicity. Though the magistrate is bound to grant the license upon oath, he has found out that he may throw any difficulty he pleases in the way of taking the oath. He may demand a distinct belief in any hierarchy of dæmons he chuses to people hell with, and say he doubts the recusant's conviction of the perils of perjury. Now to this there seems a remedy. Whatever the magistrate believes in,—find a brother that will believe more. This will act if the question is of licensing a room. But if it is of licensing an individual, I counsel him, if he is taken to task by the magistrate on the existence of a

state of future reward, to say "he hopes so" for the sake of himself and friends; and if he is further catechised on a state of punishment, to say "he hopes so" for the sake of his Worship and acquaintances. Hope is enough for any man, and we shall see if any dare quarrel with this "hope that is in us." In this manner you may run a race with bigotry; and the devil take the hindmost. At the same time form yourselves into knots and divisions, of individuals agreeing in opinion; for as iron sharpeneth iron, so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend. Sharpen one another in the four corners of your room at once, if it is large enough. Try, in each corner, to ascertain what it is you believe, and why; always recollecting that you are not to quarrel with anybody in the other angles of the parallelogram for coming to a different conclusion. If any should be found among you, who by writing or word of mouth can lead you to profiting, hear him gladly; always remembering, that the touchstone of merit is to lead men towards the improvement of the short space which we call life. An interesting pursuit for some might be, to try to ascertain the real nature of the theory put forth in the books which may be called Christian as distinguished from the Jewish; in which it would be curious to see, which heresy it is the Christian books have actually promulgated, and how little fortune the veritable thing has ever made among mankind.

One thing more. As a method of gratifying a sentiment very general in the present day, and which without any unreasonable sacrifices would have a tendency to attract public respect and attention, it might be highly useful if such as inwardly approve of the proceeding, would declare on the fitting occasions, that they *request* to be allowed to omit the form of swearing, and to make an affirmation instead; but at the same time intimating, that they do not think the exhortation to that effect, is construable to the extent of demanding of them to forego civil rights, where governments calling themselves Christian have taken upon themselves to attach that penalty to the observation of the rule.

If any of the above is charged with unnecessary vigour, it is produced to meet the demand of the Established Sect for razing half the metropolis, and transplanting the people of the manufacturing towns into rural slave-hutches, under the control of "a landlord and a good clergyman."

P.S. 7 Oct.—Though it is disadvantageous to mingle subjects, I write to say, that the political crisis is grave. The alarm here is great; but you will be kept in the dark;

you will learn nothing of it from the London papers, because they cannot do without the government advertisements. The ministry have determined on a war. Whigs are saying, that *this time* they will partition France. Men of sense are quitting them in all directions; commercial men are shaking in their shoes, and saying "Who would have believed it?" A Tory coalition is to make up for all. The plan is to get us into a war while the House of Commons is not sitting, and then tell us there is nothing to be done but go on; and the object in view in all, is to put a stop to the agitation for Reform in England and for Repeal in Ireland. They are mad; and nothing will cure them but what cures mad dogs. The French ministers have gone in a body to Louis Philippe, to say there must be war or they must resign; and the king has tried to gain time by summoning the Chambers. There is talk of the French immediately sending twenty thousand men to the assistance of Mohammed Ali.

I do not know that there is much use in asking anybody to stir. When a nation has in cold blood determined that there shall be no popular branch to hinder a ministry from going to war in partridge-shooting time, and when the popular representatives have all left their *carte blanche* with the minister on quitting for their serious occupations, why should not it reap as it has sown? One thing only might save us; to imitate Louis Philippe, and call for the instant meeting of parliament. I am told the Queen is with the partitioners.

Tell the Chartists that if there is a war, they will be sure to get Universal Suffrage directly. As this is the worst advice possible, it will be certain to be given them; so we may as well give it ourselves.

London, 6 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Manchester Advertiser.

No. I.

"Thick and thin" Repeal of the Corn Laws.—New Holy Alliance War.

Sir,—The acquaintance we had a year ago, induces me to trouble you with the following remarks.

Your contemporary of the *Manchester Times*, on Saturday last presents the following passage.—

"In August last year, Mr. Gibson, in addressing the electors of Cambridge, made an excellent speech in favour of the repeal of the corn laws, but he is reported to have said that he would pledge himself to no specific plan, but was inclined to favour a moderate fixed duty:—'It must not, however, be supposed that he would *repeal those laws suddenly*, and as it were in a moment; it must be considered that, although wrong in themselves, various interests had grown up with them and were engrafted on them, which would be taken into consideration; they were not to *plunge into repeal* through thick and thin, like Colonel Thompson, who said that if a man met you once, twice, or thrice on the highway, and robbed you, it was no reason why his depredations should be perpetuated. These and other *ad captandum* arguments were uttered by the gallant colonel; but he (Mr. Gibson) contended, that *after having encouraged the system all these years, it would be unfair to turn round upon them without fair and proper notice.*'"

Though your contemporary adds that he "understands that the report of Mr. Gibson's speech at Cambridge is very inaccurate," yet he knows it was "an excellent speech in favour of the repeal of the corn laws." Without, therefore, standing on any particular precision in the terms, I have to request you will insert the following extracts from the *Catechism on the Corn Laws*, taken from an edition of 1834, and in how many earlier editions, to 1827, I cannot at this moment tell. In the third page, after the Introduction :—

How should the injustice be removed, so as to produce the greatest good and the least suffering?

A. By removing it gradually. Give them time. Give them ten years, if they please; beginning with the present, and taking off a tenth yearly till it is gone. But remove it.

And subsequently ;—

59. That the gold would be carried away to buy corn, and cause a run upon the bank.

A. If the prohibition was taken off all at once, there is no saying whether it might cause a run upon the bank. But if the alteration was gradual, it could no more produce this effect, than a trade with Petersburg for hemp. The grower of corn has not an appetite for gold, which is absent in the grower of hemp. If the corn trade had a tendency to create a want of gold, the hemp trade would do the same; and that it does not, is a proof that either the gold is not carried away at all, or it comes back as fast as it goes.

And again ;—

331. That one thing is clear; that it is unquestionably and most ur-

A. There will never be any permanent basis, but that of abolition. It may not come all at once, any more than in the case

gently needful that we should have the laws regulating the admission of foreign grain placed upon a steady and permanent basis. — *Quarterly Review, No. 72. Article on Agriculture and Rent. p.* 446.

of the slave trade; but it will come as certainly. It may be essential to the prudent removal, that it should be done gradually: but this will not prevent its being done effectually. The progress which public opinion has made and is making, seems to put it as much out of the limits of probability, that there should be corn laws in Great Britain ten years hence—except in part process of legal extinction—as that there should be a slave trade.

[*The next paragraph is omitted, as irrelevant to the present question.*]

Finally, if an intelligent and honest elector were asked what he required that his representative should undertake to press upon the legislature in his place, it would be, that whatever duties, or scale of duties varying with the price of corn or otherwise, should be laid on importation, he should move as an amendment, "That the sum of "[.] shillings per quarter, or such sum of inferior magnitude as "shall in any case be equal to the whole of any amount or quantity "from which deduction is hereinafter directed to be made, be deducted "from the said duties, or from every respective article or degree of the "said scale of duties, on the first day of January next following; and that "the like sum of [ ] shillings per quarter, or sum of inferior magni-"tude in case as aforesaid, be in like manner deducted from the actual "remainder or remainders, on every succeeding first day of January, till "the whole be removed." This would be a permanent basis; and any other, it may be prophesied, will not. Such a motion might not make much way at first; but like the motion against the slave trade, it would end in being carried. And whoever makes it, will be the father of the abolition.

When this shall have been accomplished, the next thing is for the commercial and manufacturing interests to ask for compensation for past wrongs;—not in the shape of a duty on home-grown corn for a period equal to that for which the agriculturists have had one upon foreign,—but in the shape of a gradual removal of taxation from industry to rent, of such a magnitude as on the principles of the comparative value of perpetual and temporary annuities, shall be equivalent to the other. This is justice; and as long as this is not done, justice is not obtained.

Now upon this I am sure that Mr. Gibson will admit, with as much good humour as I propose it, that the fact was he neither knew what I had said or what I had not, and that it would have been unfair to expect it of him, standing, as he did, in the situation of a young man trying to talk himself into a seat in parliament. It is clear that instead of "plunging into repeal through thick and thin like Colonel Thompson," I had drawn out, as laboriously as if I had been attorney for the parties, a perfect schedule, with blanks and everything

desirable, for effecting any the most gradual repeal which anybody would consent to. And really the passage attributed to me on the subject of being "met once, twice, or thrice, on the highway and robbed," is one I do not recollect; though there is so much of apparent truth about it, that there is no necessity for anybody to be ashamed of it. Mr. Gibson knows very well I do not want to hit at *him*. We are always glad to receive a "gentle convertite;" but still, they should not exactly run down the older hands, without at all events knowing they are accurate. I was very near having the opportunity of answering Mr. Gibson at Cambridge myself; having been prevented by nothing but the trivial accident, that I was at Manchester instead.

But what I *do* want, is to point out to such of my friends as have not forgotten me, the clear evidence that the whigs of Manchester *do not wish or intend* to do any thing real against the corn laws. They are looking about for something else, to wit, the securing their own friends in the power of doing mischief; of which the newest shape seems to be the running us into a war for the purpose of stopping further reform. They use the corn laws for the sake of those it may enable them to carry along with them; but they have no serious designs in that direction. Your whigs, in their flirtations with the corn laws, desire *no issue*.

P.S. 8 Oct.—Since the above was written, the political crisis has become so grave, that I should be charged with thoughtlessness if I omitted to allude to it. The alarm here is great, but you in the country will be kept in the dark; you will learn nothing of it from the London papers, because *they cannot do without the government advertisements*. The whole of the metropolitan press is in the hands of government or the tories; there is not an organ.

The ministry have determined on joining Russia in a new Holy Alliance war. Whigs are saying, that *this time* they will partition France. Men of principle are quitting them in all directions; and commercial people are shaking in their shoes, and crying "Who would have believed it?" A tory coalition is to make up for all. The plan is to get us into a war while there is no House of Commons sitting, and then tell us there is nothing to be done but go on; and the object at the bottom of all is, to put a stop to the agitation for reform in England, and for repeal in Ireland.

The explanation lies in one word, treason. The men who were raised to power as the friends of peace, commerce, and reform, have chosen the time of the absence of parliament to

go over to the aristocracy, and engage us in another war against liberal opinions. What may be the respective interests of your Manchester traders calling themselves liberals, in the result that seems impending? and what have they done, or are likely to do, towards hindering its consummation? Are they not at this moment hunting about for somebody who will make them the minimum quantity of cold hustings' promises, squeezed out of an unwilling gentleman whose performance is sure to be ten times colder than his vows? Will they or theirs ever oppose anybody in power, resist anybody? It is not their vocation; be convinced they meant to get all they could for themselves in the shape of sixpenny relaxations of duties from a minister, and turn you over to the Holy Alliance for the rest.

The French are said to be going to send twenty thousand troops to the assistance of the old man, whom our whigs attack because he has been for thirty years the fastest friend of England and Englishmen. The French have the sense to see, that the partitioning plan may as well be resisted first as last. Wrap up your Anti-Corn-Law League and Covenant; the whigs have murdered the women and children at Beyrout on purpose to smother it. Would to God we had been born New Zealanders, rather than in this beggarly nation without a government, where a couple of lords can take advantage of parliament being partridge-shooting, to lead us without resistance to be the engines of their designs against mankind!

There is but one chance for us; and that, I suppose, nobody will stir for. And that would be, to do like Louis Philippe, and call for the immediate assembling of parliament. If it is not done, France is a free nation, while we shall deserve to have the Cossacks barracked in our Chambers of Commerce.

London, 5 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editors of the Sheffield Iris.

No. I.

WAR WITH, AND THREATENED PARTITION OF, FRANCE.—MOHAMMED ALI THE FRIEND OF ENGLAND.—OBJECT OF THE WAR, TO PREVENT POLITICAL IMPROVEMENT AT HOME.

SIRS,—I had intended taking advantage of your permission, to commence a correspondence which would have been chiefly

on commercial and economical subjects, when I find all such questions frighted from their propriety, by the sudden turn political events have taken under the management of our present rulers. You will hear as little as possible of it from the London press; for the simple reason that all the London press is in the hands of those interested to the contrary. But I assure you the circumstances are grave, and make it only of the more importance, that you in the country towns at all events *should hear*.

Well-informed men have no doubt, that the ministry have determined on going to war with France through Mohammed Ali; that is to say, they have determined on so dealing with Mohammed Ali, as they know in their own consciences and intend, shall lead to a general war. Whigs are going about saying, "*This time*, we will partition France." That a political party should be taken with judicial madness, is no new thing; and this is of it. We must not reason upon such facts, but act. The only object which in their insanity they can have in view, is to put a stop to the agitation for Reform in England, and Repeal in Ireland. Their attack on Mohammed Ali is totally without justification or temptation; and consequently it is plain they have a mark beyond. He has never been anything but the devoted friend of England and Englishmen; as all of us who have ever chanced to see the pyramids, with our wives and children, can testify. At this moment the gallant old man, whom the hired newspapers (the curse of hirelings be on them) are calling "tyrant" and "barbarian," is declaring that no Englishman shall be hurt as long as he can hinder it, and inviting your commerce to his ports if the blockaders will let it pass, though it is true that your principal trade with him, which would be in corn, is cut off by the tyrannical laws of our own country. His position in Syria was secured to him by solemn Treaties. The Turks attacked him, in the territory secured to him by Treaties; and he drove them back. And then, when the pear of the English ministry is ripe, they attack him again, with a view to bring on a war with France, if as in honour bound she opposes the infraction of solemn engagements. All this is simply what in ordinary society is called base; and it is the same in politics. Russia, meanwhile, who covets Turkey, is gulling the fools with encouragement and assistance. The Russian fleet in the Black Sea has, it is understood, been invited by Lord Palmerston to pass the Dardanelles and come into the Mediterranean,—an operation, as you well know, which has been the object of so much jealousy, and guarded against by so many Treaties.

The Russian Baltic fleet also is on its way to the Mediterranean; the visible purpose of the whole, being to outnumber and destroy the French fleet in that sea. Russia and the English ministry are, in fact, carrying on that sort of combination, in which each party has a different object of its own, and hopes the turn of the dice will favour it. England's object, as I said, is to stop political agitation, by involving the country in war. Russia calculates, that from the attack on Mohammed Ali, one of two consequences must arise, either of which will be trumps to her. Either Mohammed Ali will resist, or he will not. If he resists, then the strongest portion of the Turkish power,—the only part in which much vitality resides, and to which the Turks look with any enthusiasm and hope, (the proof of which is in the fact of the Turkish fleet having just joined Mohammed Ali of its own accord), will, she hopes, be put *hors de combat* with English assistance. If he does not resist, then the same thing will be done by the Sultan's forces, and thus Turkey will cut her own throat. The war, so far as the Turks are engaged on either side, is a war between a worn-out Court which our ministers are pleased to call legitimate, and the feelings of the Turkish nation, which are concentrating in another direction, as the feelings of our own country deserted the court of James, and concentrated themselves about a Dutchman.

And for these detestable objects, treasonable and worthy to be visited with the extreme punishment as regards the breach of the principles of public right and independence consecrated by the British Constitution, and unspeakably execrable as they involve the greatest imaginable breach of what (if there is such a thing) may be denominated the private honour of statesmen, —for these objects, unapproachable in baseness and wickedness by anything within the range of history, you the hard-working men of Sheffield, are to shut up your forges, to go home to your families with three men's wages among four, to find an utter stop put to the hopes with which you cheered yourselves of future amendment through the medium of political improvement, and to see your sons bought up by money levied out of your own sweat and toil, and carried off by recruiting parties to feed the lust of your aristocrats, by being food for the gunpowder of freemen in other lands. For the sake of preventing your own freedom, you are to be led out for mutual slaughter, against that brave French people, whose successful daring ten years ago, caused any degree of breaking down the old round of injustice, which you since can boast of. Do you remember how in those days you hoped, and feared, and rejoiced; and

in ten years afterwards, you are to be led out like beasts to battle in a brutish cause, to please two lords, for there are no more, who see in the ruin of your peaceful occupations, the means of preventing your political improvement.

Listen to me, black, smoky, greasy, honest men of Sheffield. I have stood before you, when those who might better have done it, kept out of the way; and you will hear little of them now. We must stop this war if we can; and if we cannot. *we must make the best of it.* I am a proscribed man from parliament, because I have seen from the beginning the progress of these things and have opposed them; but I am not proscribed with you, nor with millions more, who will cease to be a "Slave Class," in spite of all Whig wars can do to hinder it.

To the rich among you,—to those who are lucky enough to sit at the top of the tree of honest industry, from which good fruits are shaken down upon the lowest,—I would calmly and deliberately put the question, why, and for what reason, they should consent to give up their plans for honourable wealth, in exchange for what is to come to them from dishonourable war. Call for your children of all ages, place them before you, run over in your mind the plans you had for their several benefits, and all dependent on your success in honest commerce; and give any reason if you can, why all this should be surrendered, in order that two Whig lords may stop Reform.

In this crisis of your interests, conduct yourselves like sensible men; it is not for me to intimate you are likely to do otherwise, but there will be no harm in pointing out the way. One only chance is left us; which is, to make an instant and general demand for the assembling of parliament. The plot is, to get us into a war while there is no House of Commons, and then tell us there is nothing to be done but go on. Do not give up the best privilege of a free nation, that of deliberating on its own affairs; if you do, you had better decree at once, that the government of England shall be six months in the year a despotism. Put yourselves at the head of the people, whose interests are the same as yours,—and he is a gull and a fool who ever thought they were eventually different,—and call, not for decision, not for judgment, but for the assembly of the jury who are to try the cause.

Excuse me for being long; but we are a long way from the state where honest men should sleep in quiet.

London, 8 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Bolton Free Press.

No. III.

WHY SHOULD ENGLAND GO TO WAR?—ENGLISH BREACH OF FAITH.—WE MUST HAVE WAR OR REFORM.

SIR,—The importance of the case must excuse my further directing your attention to a subject which may appear remote from the original objects of our correspondence.

The question is raised, whether all our speculations on commercial improvements shall be put an end to, by the base, vulgar, and treacherous expedient of involving us in war. For that there is no cause for war, that it is a thing searched out and made for the purpose and the occasion, is within the reach of the most moderate observation. Has anybody hurt you at Bolton? Have you heard of anybody being hurt or threatened with harm, in any of the places with which you correspond? Can you point to anybody who has been hurt or threatened anywhere? Has anybody seized or stopped any of your wares or manufactures on board of ship? Has there been any *Vixen* case, for example? Nothing like it. You know in your own consciences, and every man of you has it distinctly before his eyes, that there has not been the smallest injury done anybody, that there is not the slightest reason of complaint, that the pretence for involving you in a war is nothing but a longing desire to attack an old friend and ally, who has established his claim to those titles not merely by words written on paper or parchment by men calling themselves a government, but by the more substantial facts of having been the ancient and constant friend of England and Englishmen, anxious for our commerce now, and able to promote it to a vast extent if we were rid of the blasting laws which prevent you from selling your goods for what would sell here in return. When England and English merchants were injured in the case of the *Vixen*, the ministry said it could not be mended but by going to war with Russia, and that they would not do. When England was grossly insulted again by the breach of Treaties by Russia on the subject of Cracow where England was a guarantee, our broad-bottomed ministry again exposed themselves for kicking, and (without anybody's demanding of them that they should break out into heroics and appeal to arms) refused to do what is done by every man in private society who is not more timid than ordinary or else a confederate in the wrong, appeal simply to

the judgment of the world by a protest. Our ministry, I say then, not only dared not resist, but would not protest. And now a few months afterwards, they are found insisting on plunging us into war at the beck and to serve the purposes of the power which they allowed to kick them before, *for* no English interest but *against* all English interests, in direct breach and defiance of all previous conventions to which they were parties, the breach of which is just as disgraceful to statesmen as point-blank cheating and falsehood are to a private individual. The English ministers, by themselves or their agents whose acts they adopted, had set their hands to the settlement between the Sultan and Mohammed Ali in 1833. What business they had to be interfering at all between the Sultan and the Pasha, may be a question to ask; but, in the actual case, they had made themselves parties to stipulations favourable to the Pasha. In 1838, at a time when the Pasha was supposed engaged in Æthiopia, the Sultan, with the contempt of treaties exhibited by all governments who are not kept in order by an honest popular control, attacked the troops of the Pasha, at the instigation, it is lamentable to say, of an English authority who holds the unenviable position of being able to do as much mischief as he pleases; and his army was soundly beaten back. Out of this the English ministry, instead of endeavouring to revert to the state of things to which they had engaged themselves, spy the opportunity of involving us in war. France, as any individual man of honour and honesty would do in corresponding circumstances, says "Adhere to what was settled by Treaty. Treaties should be sacred, for they are the securities of mankind for avoiding bloodshed. A breach of Treaty is a national lie, and the disgrace of partnership is sprinkled over all who quietly acquiesce. *Woe to them that keep not Treaties!*" France has naturally and properly the same feelings towards us under our actual direction, that a gentleman and honest man has when he finds he has been inveigled into an association with cheats and people of no faith and credit. It is in vain to try to disguise the case; for the facts are such. The London press may be bought up, and set to abuse the gallant old man who is at this moment declaring, despite his burning towns and filthily massacred population, that no English merchant or other within his bounds shall be harmed while he can help it. All this may gull simpletons; who make rather a large cry. But it will not gull your cool-headed thoughtful manufacturers at Bolton, who will ask what all this is for, and why they are to be the sufferers.

And what is it all for? Who are to be the gainers, and how? In the first place there is what may be called the *felonry* of the country, which exists in this as it does to a certain extent in every other; meaning thereby all those individuals and classes, who look for profit and advancement from slaughter and robbery, in contradiction to honest and honourable exertion of any kind;—men who are just as delighted to see unresisting women and children slaughtered at Beyrout by firing into a town which had no means of resistance, as they would be to see *your* wives and children slaughtered, if the same objects of desire were at the end of it. And next there are all those, making the most powerful class of the two, who look forward to engaging you in war, as the means of stopping political agitation here and in Ireland. In both these classes, you must be sensible our aristocracy form a large portion; though this is the place for adding, that there is also a portion that is on the other side. The object is to divert your attention from your present objects. You are to ask "How many women and children were killed at some other Beyrout," instead of "What will be the probable division this time upon the Corn Laws." You are to form Volunteer corps, that you may not form Reform Associations. Irishmen are to be brigaded under colonels who "do not allow their men to take the temperance pledge," in order that they may be engaged in making more St. Sebastians and Badajoz abroad, instead of tossing up their caps for Repeal at home. This was the old Roman plan for getting rid of political agitation; but the Romans were avowedly "the most determined brigands that ever appeared upon the earth," and had no commercial or honest middle classes to keep their government in check. Since you have both, do what the Romans ought to have done and could not.

In London there is a symbol of resistance in the shape of a placard with the words "We cannot afford to go to war." What a confession this is, that there would be no hindering war but by such impossibility. You see the condition you the working bees of the state are in. It is a thing avowed and admitted, that under our present state of government, we are never as a nation to lay up to the amount of twenty shillings a-head, but there is a government ready to seize it and expend it on wicked and useless war. Now is there no mending such a condition of things? And have you at Bolton no interest in mending it? You have pretty well got rid of the antique race of highwaymen, and the more plebeian one of footpads. Housebreakers too are rare among you; and it is a comparatively

small proportion of the wealthy men of Bolton, who die by the hands of people who conceal themselves under their beds. Against all these you have found the means of preserving yourselves; but not against that other set of spoilers, who have only to set their hands to paper and say, "Stop your "mills, blow out your forges, cut down your custom to what "may be wanted for uniforms and musket-barrels, for which "yourselves shall pay." Against this class of evil-doers, as Jeremy Bentham would have called them, you have got very little security indeed. Now would it not be better to have some? Would it not be better to try the question now? Could anything be more politic and wise, than that instead of leaving it to be settled by your grandchildren who may perhaps be in the poor-house, you should settle it yourselves?

Set about it to-morrow. Lay aside distinctions of parties for a few hours, and give the ministers to understand they may play at anything they like except war. In a really free state, like America, war cannot be commenced without being debated and consented to by the representatives of the people; and in your case, the ministers are to get up a dishonourable war while the House of Commons is partridge-shooting, and then tell you there is no help for it but go on. You made a considerable outcry when some half-starved and half-crazed Chartist talked of throwing a ten-penny nail into your machinery. Do not let the great Anti-Chartists shut up your machinery at a single blow, without demanding that at least parliament shall be assembled to know the why and the wherefore.

London, 15 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXX.

M. Thiers' Note to Lord Palmerston.—Why Mohammed Ali is to be put down.—Specimens of the Whig Press.—Plan for getting up a General War.—Mean Policy copied from Mr. Canning.—Real History of Mohammed Ali.—The Whigs in full Holy Alliance Costume.

Sir,—The crisis still continues in all its interest. The London papers of this morning (13 Oct.) give the answer of the French ministry to Lord Palmerston's Memorandum of Aug. 30; and as usual the Morning Herald carries its information further than the rest. *Another Note*, added after news of the disgraceful business at Beyrout had arrived at

Paris, and which had not on this day reached the public, seems now to be the point on which the interest is concentrated.

The French answer is really a beautiful performance. So like what an honest man and a gentleman writes when it is his fate to be beleaguered with a nest of sharpers, trying to pick a quarrel with him for the purpose of damaging him either in person or in property. It is clear enough what the trick was. On the 27th of July 1839, the assent of France was obtained, with perfect readiness, to an agreement to prevent Mohammed Ali from marching upon Constantinople; which would have been followed by the entrance of a Russian army into the capital of Turkey, and so have endangered a general war. But directly afterwards France finds out, that this agreement has been changed by the English ministry into an agreement to put down Mohammed Ali, *because he is not legitimate.* Of course, if the Holy Alliance for legitimacy is to be got up again, France may as well resist first as last; it is only a military question with her, whether she will begin now, or wait till the attack is brought nearer to her gates. If the people of England were not the veriest dullards that ever left their mouths open to see what come into them, they would see the same; for after all, the people of England really have some feeling in favour of their own liberty and other people's, though like the bottom of some ditches, it is a long time before it is come at. The people of England were considerably stirred during the "Three Days" in France. I saw a man in the Strand selling little tri-coloured nosegays, none making him afraid; and I sent one to a friend in Paris, saying "It is plain enough the people of England have taken their side." Some of them were even so rampant, that nothing would serve them but a vehement desire to turn out at once into the streets; forgetting that they were a poor disarmed people, accustomed to fly at the sound of their masters' horsewhips, like those slaves of old, who stood the sword, but ran at the sight of scourges and the bilboes.

And now these very men of the "Three Days" are holding out their hands to them, and saying "Will you be made the instruments to attack us, by a government which after cheating you with professions of peace, commerce, and economy, can find nothing to do but set the Holy Alliance on its legs again, by way of stopping your troublesome demands for Reform?" Read over the French ministry's reply to Lord Palmerston,—you will find it in any London paper of the 13th of October,—and see whether the simple fact is not, that the French are putting themselves forward as the friends of peace, justice,

and liberty all over the world, and you stand as the beggarly, down-trodden slaves, of the wickedest and most treacherous ministers that ever drove men to slaughter in an infamous cause. You have excuse. Everybody is banded together to throw dust into your eyes. The metropolitan daily press is in the hands of your enemies. You are to be hood-winked, and when the meeting of parliament uncovers a little corner of one eye, you are to find the collar fast locked on you and yours, and be fixed for being the hewers of wood and drawers of water for an Alliance of Holy despots for the next thirty years.

To prove what I have said, let me give you a specimen or two of what calls itself to this day the Whig liberal press.

'The *Times* seeks to embarrass the Government, and to create a prejudice against it in the event of England being forced into a war with France, by asking, "Whether, if England opens the year 1841 with a "costly and perhaps interminable war, will she be able to tell her chil-"dren of the next generation, who will have 'to pay the bill,' that the "contest was one into which she was innocently and most unwillingly "drawn, and one to avoid which all wise and reasonable precautions "were taken?"

'The answer to this is easy and conclusive. England's children will cheerfully pay whatever expenses may be incurred in a war with France, should such a war unhappily occur, just as we cheerfully pay the expenses of the war which our predecessors were obliged, in self-defence, to wage with that country. Had not the generation which preceded us boldly grappled with France, when her destinies were in the hands of Napoleon, this country would long before this have ceased to be the glorious, powerful, and independent country it now is. Nor will our posterity need to be told, should we be now dragged into a war with France, that it will be far better for them to pay the bill of costs, than for us to have allowed France to reduce this country to the insignificance, weakness, and degradation of a mere province.'

Now to this, allow me to give the most point-blank and forcible denial by which an opposite opinion can be decently expressed. England's children *will not* cheerfully pay whatever expenses may be incurred in a war with France, any more than they would cheerfully pay the expenses of burning their own houses or violating their own female relatives; and for the self-same reason, that they know the proceeding to be wicked, dishonourable, contrary to their own palpable interests and honest and reasonable feelings. We *do not* cheerfully pay the expenses of the war which our predecessors were obliged, in self-defence, to wage with that country. We know that the war was *not* in self-defence, but in defence of the rotten boroughs. The last division of that war, arose out of the refusal to keep

the treaties which had been made at the close of the preceding one; everybody both here and in France knows that. Instead of cheerfully paying the expenses, we would call upon the people everywhere to refuse payment of the interest, if we did not happen to know, that this unfortunately could make no increase of national strength, nor even act as a warning by falling on the guilty. We bow before the wretched fact, that money once spent and laid upon the fundholders, is irrecoverable, as in the case of any other spendthrift expenditure. If refusing the interest to the fundholders would bring the capital back again, we would counsel it to-morrow. But there will be no use in trying whether the horse's back will break. It will at some time. A time will come, when spite of counsel, the payment of the interest, if increased, will be refused; and then the only hope is, that in the midst of the public distress and agitation which must ensue, some of the guilty may be laid hold of and brought to retribution. But be sure of one thing; we will not pay cheerfully, we will not counsel anybody to pay cheerfully, we will work ourselves to the utmost to make everybody conscious of the iniquity, as it was in past times, now, and is to be; we will conjugate it through all moods and tenses; and see if we do not end in setting up an extraordinary commentary upon the Whig prophecy that we should pay cheerfully.

As in the past times, so it is now. The plan of the public robber, is first to make us an enemy, and then tell us we must fight to keep him away. The generation that preceded us fell into this snare. They first made Napoleon, and then they were told to grapple with him. Instead of being gulled by being told of our country being "the glorious, powerful, and independent country it now is," we answer that it is inglorious because bad men disgrace it by injustice, weak because we have within ourselves an enemy which by prohibiting commerce cuts down its strength to a fraction of its natural extent, and instead of independent, dependent on the will of any evil ruler who chuses to lead its people to slaughter in the attack of other men's freedom, by way of insuring the restriction of their own. We will pay no bill of costs that we can help. We have before us the utter injustice, baseness, and infamy, of the war against our own liberties, into which we are on the point of being plunged by the traitor Whigs; and we give warning that no stone shall be left unturned, to make the denouement present a splendid triumph for European liberty, in what was intended to be its grave.

Do you know what this Holy Alliance doctrine is? Those

who are under forty may be excused for not knowing; but the others should have told them. It means that your liberties and mine and everybody's, shall be held subject to the approbation of a union of foreign and domestic despots, and foreigners be brought in to put down all struggles for increased liberty, which the domestic despots think themselves unable to crush by themselves. England is at the head of this base policy, and her Indian habits cast their hue over her proceedings. In India the British make and unmake kings; and as all of them have had their enemies, there is always somebody the British can proclaim legitimate, as the means of doing away with the courtesies and humanities of war, such as they are, towards their antagonists. To take an example, everybody who knows India, remembers that the Peishwa was seated on the throne by British power, in opposition to the resistance of a portion of his countrymen. Twelve or fifteen years afterwards, the Peishwa failed to please the British; and then a general was directed to "accomplish the restoration of the legitimate sovereign of the Mahrattas," who was brought out of pickle for the occasion, and Mr. Canning stood up in the House of Commons and said, "It had been the policy of Bri- "tain, in all her transactions in those countries, to adopt this "simple mode of punishing usurpers." (Mr. Canning in the House of Commons, 4 March, 1819.)

If these men landed in England or Ireland, they would begin by declaring the Protestants rebels to James, and the Catholics to Elizabeth, Personal virulence is the great instrument of their warfare. Take the immediate instance. "Mohammed Ali is a tyrant, and the curse of the countries under his sway." Such is the manifesto of one of the self-called liberal papers. Take now his description from a different hand; which I give, because it is in all points consistent with my personal knowledge so far as it extends. "If England is to be involved in this quarrel, it behoves us to inquire who this Mohammed Ali is, and what objects we can have in the contest. Mohammed was a grocer's son, who went to Egypt in a servile capacity, and found the country suffering under all the most deplorable effects of bad government. By dint of genius he acquired the sovereignty of the people, and raised them and their nation to a state of happiness and importance which it had not known for a thousand years. Egypt was always the plague-spot, the lazar-house, the convict colony of the Turkish Empire, and yet the country possessed, from position, climate, and soil, an immense number of advantages; and, even sixty years ago, European cabinets entertained

projects of bringing it into political and moral existence. The superb and well-designed expedition of the French, in 1798, was unfortunately opposed by England, and the genius of Buonaparte had not scope for exertion; but happy had it been for civilization and humanity, had England not obstructed the settlement of the French in Egypt. Well, Mohammed Ali has effected wonders in that country; he has established founderies, a mint, cloth manufactories, indigo, sugar, and cotton plantations. He has allowed the peasants and farmers to bring their own corn to market, and he has virtually abolished the Corn Laws of the country, founded upon principles which we have not sense enough to get rid of; he has permitted the peasant to kill his own cattle, and to sell his beasts, eggs, fowls, and every other article of produce in open market without duty. The Criminal Code has been humanised, and the punishment of death has been almost abolished, although the English continue it where it is totally unnecessary. Egypt was before him impassable to foreigners, but now every European can pass through villages and plains, or climb mountains, or ramble in all directions, with by far greater safety than foreigners could do the same things even in England. This philosophic Statesman has liberated the females from their former vassalage, servitude, and incarceration, and he has placed them in the condition of European females with respect to their intercourse with society. As to religious freedom he has performed miracles, and, giving immense latitude to freedom of thought and discussion, he has confined his resentment only to renegades, who change opinions from motives of interest. The celebrated traveller Burckhardt was repelled by him because he adopted Mohammedanism as *a convenience* in travelling through the country. The revenues of Egypt have been quadrupled. The half-naked and unarmed tribes of Lebanon and Arabia have been well clothed and brought under military discipline. Mohammed has likewise produced a Navy by far more powerful at this instant than that of Spain, Portugal, Austria, Italy, or Turkey, and it is questionable whether it is not able to cope with that of Russia. He is by far the greatest of all existing Reformers, and yet there is a disposition to find fault with his personal character. The same conduct was pursued towards Peter the Great and Frederick the Great, and against every man who has, by genius and a combination of all great and good qualities, attempted to ameliorate his fellow-creatures. Why should the English attempt to crush such a man? Why not let him reign over territories which he has thus acquired, when the

alternative is that he should be superseded on the principle of legitimacy by a barbarian? The French take a by far more noble view of the subject, and they would secure to the man what he has so nobly won."

If you doubt me, ask Dr. Bowring, who has been there since I have; and whose Report, I see, has been most unhandsomely and dishonestly made use of, to abuse you and the public. The Doctor, like an honest man, set down both what Mohammed Ali had done in the way of improvement, and what he had yet to do. And the knaves that are over us, picked out all they thought would serve them, and omitted the other.

But the secret is out. Mohammed Ali is to be attacked, and you are to pay for it, because he is "a grocer's son." Napoleon in the same way, was to be attacked because he was an attorney's. The war is against you and me and all of us, who have not got what the Spaniards call the "blue blood" of nobility in our veins, but only the ordinary red stuff, which when it is shed can hardly be distinguished from a bullock's. But besides this, which may be called the personal reason, there is a peculiar political one. In Canada, the law and constitution were broken with horrible bloodshed by the present ministers, for which punishment hangs over their heads whenever the nation shall come to its senses, and all for the sake of preserving a monopoly at your expense. See how God's justice drives men from bad to worse, making their own successes the instruments of their punishment, as vulgar thieves are forced from crime to crime till they finish on the scaffold. The blood of Canada lies on them; *that* pushes them into necessary alliance with every despot that has a liberty to crush. If the Cossacks should be unruly, you must assist the Czar to put down "his slave" the Hetman; for such is the reason given by a ministerial journal for the proceedings against Mohammed Ali. If the man in the moon had a satellite to quarrel with, you would be made to pay for keeping it in order.

Listen to the great ministerial organ.—

'The European commonwealth cannot fail to look with great jealousy on the advancement of any doctrines calculated to undermine sovereign authority in any part of the world.'—*Morning Chronicle*, 13 *Oct.* 1840.

Here, you see, are our Whigs in full Holy Alliance costume. The oldest Tory never said anything better. When your grandchildren ask what this war which is now beginning was

about, let them have it under your handwriting in some corner cupboard, that it was for securing to Englishmen "the blessings of bad timber and the multiplication of bugs."

London, 14 *Oct.* 1840.

P.S. Oct. 15.—There seems no doubt that the Tories' policy is to help the Whigs into hostilities with all or anybody, and then take the government on the ground that they are the only men to carry on a war. A party is understood to exist in the cabinet for peace. They had better turn out, to keep up the breed; or the Whig name will be extinct. It would be a fine moment for a rising young aristocrat, accustomed to diplomacy on the popular side. Lord Clarendon is such a man.

To the Editor of the Manchester Advertiser.

No. II.

OBJECT OF THE WHIGS, TO DIVERT POPULAR ATTENTION BY WAR.

SIR,—You must permit me to address myself again to a subject, whose importance at this moment swallows up that of every other.

Are the present ministers, after being raised to power on the cry of Commerce, Economy, and Peace, to plunge us into a dishonourable and degrading war, because they find themselves made uneasy by the agitation for further reform in England and for repeal in Ireland?

Is your commercial and laborious population, including in that term your wealthy men who steer the great three-deckers of your industry, and downwards to the poorest child who guides a pin or holds a spindle,—is this great mass of human beings, all made of the like blood and filled with the like feelings and the same interests, to descend from its prospects, some of larger reward of industry and some of smaller, merely because Whig ministers want to divert popular attention by engaging in a war?

If there were a shadow of use or object in the Whig war, which, as you see, is begun to the destruction, as the doers boast, of a thousand women and children, for which glorious deed you will have to recompense them out of your children's

toil,—if it was even a doubtful case, and one not directly and plainly opposed to every feeling which has been inculcated from youth up on either a private gentleman or an honest man,—you would not find me standing forward to oppose it. War is an evil, for which it is necessary to be prepared. Blood for safety,—blood for honour, which may only be a remoter form of the other,—but not blood for disgrace, not for personal infamy and degradation, not to serve the purposes of knaves and tyrants at home, nor to discredit the British name abroad, making us to sneak before the eyes of foreigners, and wish we had been born in any hole except the nest of cutthroats the Whigs are making of our country. I suppose they think we do not care; that it is nothing to us whether the country has an honest fame or not, so that they gain their ends. Or perhaps they take us for those simple asses, of whom the breed it was hoped was worn out in the present generation, who are ready to be led by the nose to any foulness, so it lead from honest industry and offer robber's pay.

I have called the Whigs' war dishonourable and degrading; strong terms, and now I proceed to prove it. They began by massacring our fellow-citizens in Canada; turning out the troops upon them as the French ministers did in the celebrated Three Days, but unhappily with different success; carrying on the war against their women and children with the ferocity of barbarians, in the manner inculcated on British troops even from the fountain-head of the military law, with as much deliberation as they are taught to shoulder arms; and all for the purpose of being practised upon *yourselves*, if the occasion should arise. The British people took no note. Next came the disgraceful affairs in India, where the British troops were hounded on to their other besetment the murder of prisoners in cold blood, which has hung about the British army since the battle of Agincourt, and in which the existing army is universally involved, by the token that, men of nice punctilio as they describe themselves to you of civil callings, they know the facts and ask no questions. This, too, excited no notice; reward, in fact, was showered in a hurry on the authors. Then came the Chinese felony; where forty thieves, whose place would have been on the tread-mill, were brought up by a British minister to tell the House of Commons they were interested in the smuggling of opium by force into an unoffending country. Jobs, and misrepresentations, and falsehoods of every kind, were got up in aid, and so the English forces, nothing loth, were set on the performance of deeds, for which it would be

a most just reward, and meet with the applause of the whole civilized world of which we are not part, if every one were sent back with the loss of ears to mark them to mankind. Here, too, nobody would stir. Well then, you richly deserved what is coming upon you. I ask you whether taking the question as a whole, and not for the present discriminating between the most guilty and those who only sinned by connivance, you did not as a nation, deserve to be plunged into the greatest evil that can befall a people, a dishonourable and degrading war?

But I was to prove it so. And towards this, there is first the cause; and secondly, the mode. And cause, except the desire to stop Reform as stated, they have none.* Stripped of the falsehoods of the ministerial press, the facts are these. In 1833 the ministers, by themselves or agents, brought about an agreement between the Sultan and Mohammed Ali, of which they made themselves guarantees. In 1838 the Sultan, thinking Mohammed Ali engaged in Æthiopia, broke the convention and attacked his forces; but his army was notably defeated and driven back. In this the ministers see a chance for gratifying their present thirst for getting up a war; and so they set their foul-mouthed press to cry tyrant and barbarian against the man who has done for Egypt what Peter the Great did for Russia, changed it from a den of quarrelling barbarians into the seat of civilized security. All the allies England ever had, were never worth half so much to her as Mohammed Ali, could a few aristocrats be hindered from attacking his interests because they are ours. At this moment the gallant old man is declaring that come what will, no Englishman shall be hurt in person or goods while he can hinder it. The French naturally take his part, because they are an honourable nation, and we are not. They can put just and treaty-keeping men at their head, and we cannot; which exactly makes the difference asserted. The crime may not be of our personal will; but it is ours while we adopt it. It is true the war is not ours; it is the war of the aristocracy upon us the people. Our hearts and feelings are all with the brave and good men of the "Three Days," to whom we owe any relaxation in the ancient tyranny we are able to boast of. The war is against them and us; and it is because Mohammed Ali is our thirty years' friend and the promoter of our commerce, that he is picked out to begin the war upon.

And then the mode. Think of men who expect to come back to civilized society, to sit perhaps at our feasts and be

received into our houses, boasting as if there was glory in it, of having destroyed "at least a thousand" of the unoffending inhabitants of an unresisting town. I remember with regret, in my youthful days, once firing into a flock of pigeons, and covering the ground with killed and maimed to such an extent that I conveyed myself as fast as possible from the scene of my own making. But I never expected to be made a Knight of the Bath for it; it must be more mischief than many pigeons, to obtain that honour. Everywhere we find our sons, relations, and friends, put upon occupations which we consider as entailing personal disgrace. I had rather hear that a son of mine had been in the pillory, than that he had been doing the "brutal and bloody" business of these ministers. Our children are taught to take smugglers and scoundrels for their heroes. By and by we shall see a melodrame at Astley's, with "Enter the crew of an opium clipper, all upon barded horses, and driving the Chinese constables before them." The ministry is the great Jack Sheppard, confounding our notions of right and wrong, and holding out the gewgaws which monarchy supplies, as the rewards of deeds which deserve the gibbet. Have I explained at all, why I called the Whig wars dishonourable and degrading?

Now you at Manchester are responsible for a very considerable mass of old English feeling and substantial popular honesty, which knows that these things and their authors are base, wicked, and sure to end, if not put down, with misery to you and yours. Do you think the same men, if it suited them, would not as soon make boast of having destroyed "at least a thousand" of your women and children in Manchester, or bombarded Salford for refusing to admit their gin? He that allows himself, when he could help it, to be governed by men who fight against the civilization and humanity of the age, and want to depress us again into the instruments of cruelty our forefathers might have had the excuse of ignorance to plead for, has no right, before God or man, to complain if he finds himself the victim of the wolf he nourished.

And what are you doing in Manchester towards your share of a constitutional resistance? Looking about for a man who will promise you to do as little as he can help. Seeking for somebody who will give you a cold and humdrum assent to your question, whether he will vote against ministers if they proceed to raze half the metropolis and transplant the manufacturing population into rural divisions under the direction of a landlord and a good clergyman. Believe me there is no

security like looking out for somebody that never originated anything and never will. If you are to ride in a charge, always chuse a horse that will stand the spur, and has no "go" in him of himself; the contrary is foolhardy. When you have suffered enough, you will learn to say, "Blessed is he that cometh with a notion of doing something." But I should like to see you bestir yourselves before.

London, 15 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Suffolk Chronicle.

No. I.

Importance of Assembling Parliament.

Sir,—I receive with great satisfaction your permission to renew the acquaintance of a year or two ago, when I had the honour of addressing the Liberal inhabitants of Ipswich on the subject of the Corn Laws.

The shortness of the time before me for the present letter, obliges me to confine myself to demanding the earnest attention of your readers, to the imminent peril which all expected improvements, both commercial and political, are at this moment incurring from the evident danger of a war, which I implore them to believe, will be found on examination to be uncalled for by the slightest rational necessity, or even feasible excuse.

What is it to us, that the Sultan quarrels with his Pasha? Are we to pay the piper for the settlement of the disputes between all Sultans and all possible Pashas? At that rate, we may be called on next, to assist Russia in putting down the Hetman of the Cossacks; and if the Man in the Moon had a satellite to quarrel with, we should be expected to pay for keeping it in order.

I am afraid no reasonable account can be given for this strange and unexpected vagary of the government, but that they are tired of the agitation for further Reform and removal of the Corn Laws in England, and for Repeal of the Union in Ireland. These several agitations may be good or bad; but a general war can scarcely be the smaller evil.

The end is to be this. The Tories are to push the Whigs into a war; and then they are to take the government, on the

ground that they are the only men to carry on a war. The Whigs will then split on the two sides; and the Whig name will be extinct. There is understood to be a party in the Cabinet for peace. Surely we shall see them turn out and show themselves while it is yet time. Lord Durham would have been looked to; but Lord Clarendon is quite able to take his place.

The grand point to call for, is the immediate assembling of parliament. No despotic power in Europe durst have plunged into war with so little consultation, as will have been done by our ministers, if we find ourselves in a general war without it.

London, 15 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Bolton Free Press.

No. IV.

HOW NATIONS ARE DELUDED WITH REGARD TO WAR.—WHAT MAKES THE YOUNG SO FOND OF BLOOD.—THE APOSTLES NEVER BLESSED THE COLOURS OF A REGIMENT.

SIR,—Few appearances are at first sight more inexplicable, than the wonderful facility with which men allow themselves to be deceived, wherever large numbers are concerned at once. A darkness seems to come over their intellects so soon as their number is increased. There are few persons, for example, who have not a pretty clear conception, that if ten people were on short allowance in a boat, the introduction of one more would be a serious damage. They are capable of understanding what each would suffer, by the loss of that tithe of eatables which must be taken from them to be given to the supernumerary. But vastly less clear would be their perception of the consequences, if to a thousand men making the crew of a hundred-gun ship, a hundred more were proposed to be added. There would be something of a vague notion, that these hundred men would pick up a living about the decks, and nobody be much the worse. And if the question is of a whole nation, which shall be put upon ten-elevenths of the food it would willingly consume, the clue is lost at once, and everybody yields to the conclusion, that in some way or other, and by some contrivance or other, we shall in the end be rescued from every difficulty.

Very similar appearances may be traced, in somewhat different directions. There is no trader who, for example,

does not clearly comprehend, that if a sentry should be set at the door of each or any large portion of his customers, with strict orders to let nothing pass, his trade and traffic would be greatly damaged by the consequences; and there is no individual trader, who would not make as loud an outcry as his particular lungs could raise, in remonstrance against the evil. And it would be especially hard to find any excuse, which would set his mind at rest. Tell him it was for his individual good, or his individual honour and glory, and all the sceptics that have appeared on earth would be manageable compared with this commercial heretic. But take such men by a whole town-full together, and still more by all the towns-full that are in a nation, and they shall consent with the smallest possible resistance, to take hold of the rope which is to electrify them all at once, and allow the most frivolous pretexts and the most hacknied phrases to convince them, that what was a great evil and no honour and glory at all when it was to fall upon one at a time, is a thing to be received with resignation if not with gratitude, when it is ingeniously contrived to fall on all together.

The great foundation of this folly, is probably in an indistinct notion, that by some piece of good fortune or other, the individual will contrive to escape. A single fish when hooked, is in evident alarm; but flounders in a net display considerable equanimity, till they find themselves in the frying-pan. The frying-pan of nations, is war; and to this we are at this moment allowing ourselves to be conducted, so far at least as evidence has yet appeared, with as much quietness as any of the finny tribes can display in their approach to the natural end of their existence. Our governors are sweeping round us and about us, and every moment closing some avenue to escape, or laying some fresh obstacle in its way; and we are amusing ourselves with either thinking nothing about the matter, or reprobating the livelier fishes on the other side the Channel, who seem to have no notion of being taken unprepared by the conclusion.

With fishes it is probable the idea of the frying-pan is something exceedingly visionary and indistinct. The subjects who experimentalized on it in the highest degree, never came back to tell the story; and those who escaped with only a twinge of suspicion what it was, are probably too few to have spread their knowledge with much effect. It is even possible enough, that some young fry conceive of a frying-pan as something that was intended to give fishy life a fillip, and agreeably vary the monotony of the peaceful deep, by the

certainty that there was something else which might be found by seeking. About as wise as such notions among the fishy race, are the ideas which some of our own cods' heads and shoulders have of war. They think two sets of workmen, each engaged to burn the other's factory, is an enlivening scene. They view the ashes of their neighbour's house, as amply compensating for the cinders of their own; and if there were a chance of such conclusion as that half their own should be left standing while two-thirds of their neighbour's was consumed, they would be in raptures as at the discovery of the philosopher's stone, or some new edition of "The Young Man's certain Road to Wealth."

There is nothing exaggerated in this description. It is what the young and inexperienced are everywhere prone to give into. But there must be taken into the account the pains taken to promote the folly. The Church blesses colours, which is more than is recorded of any of the Apostles; and young men are naturally anxious to see what comes by its blessing. The monarchical portion of the government, is far too fine for any useful occupation; the only employment that does not demean royalty, is regulating the hues of the rainbow which shall be stolen to decorate the pantaloons of men painted to keep up the memory of war. All this must have its effect; and it has accordingly. We cannot expect everybody to be wise, where our institutions lead to folly. No man was ever made an hereditary ruler of the people for doing them extensive good; there is a regular organization for selecting them continually for extensive mischief.

But all this is only a reason why the cooler heads should make the greater exertions to take things into their own hands and keep them straight. Boys may brawl for a war for what they never saw, and never will see, and could not describe if they were asked; but bearded men should know, that war is all soon enough when it cannot be helped, and have no more notion of allowing an aristocratical minister or two to send them a war at pleasure, than to send them a death-warrant. A war *is* a death-warrant to hundreds of thousands; to say nothing of the ruin of hopes untimely chilled, and honest expectations stifled. A lord or two may be delighted, and look big in their coteries, as having performed some great exploit, like turkeys among meaner fowl. But a lamentable account of eggs and chickens will the housewife who must pay for all, receive for all this puffery. Why must the 130 millions which are involved in railways be an addle egg? Men made them, in the notion that they were to convey upon

them an increased commerce that should pay; and now this is to be stopped, that we may gather harvests of glory under the standards of the Holy Alliance. Let every man portion out his bankruptcy, and say, "This part was for the love of "Austria, this went for the pleasure of Prussia, this to serve "Russia, and this last bit, which would have kept my wife and "children if they had it, was unavoidably surrendered to pre-"vent the real Grand Turk from being annoyed by an illegiti-"mate Pasha with three tails." Would the Americans, think you, do anything so inexorably stupid? And will Bolton be much comforted by discovering that she is not America?

What is the use of anything called a free constitution, if it does not give people some rational security that their goods and chattels shall not be taken from them, to please some knot of men, who, by their intrinsic qualities, or anything but what their fathers made over to them, would probably never have raised themselves from one class of your operatives into the next above? And this without so much as a chance of deliberation or control by anything of the nature of popular representatives. Do not you see, that it is a bell without a tongue, a knife without a blade, a machine utterly and totally deficient in what was most essential to its efficacy Why will our lords and great men be so revolutionary, and thus insist on displaying before us the infirmer parts of the rule we live under? Be assured, they have already struck a great blow, and read a weighty lesson. Had a lecturer turned the constitution round at the end of an oyster-knife, and said, "This, gentlemen, is the place where the point goes in between the shells," he could not have shed more light on the incompetence of the frame we live under, to give us even moderate security against the exercise of arbitrary and unlicked power in the hands of individuals, or on the necessity that while we are mending, we must mend this also if we can.

In my next, if you allow of this, I will try to inquire what prudent men would do, and how.

London, 22 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXXI.

The "Partition" Policy at Elections.

Sir,—We must relieve our last subject, by a reference to the letter of B. M. in your paper of the 10th of October;

though there is nothing to hinder us from bearing in mind, that as in consulting for the future actions of a man in the cholera, the great question is whether he is to get well *now*, so in all our present consultations about what we are to do or not, the great question is whether we are to be swallowed up for good and all, by this Leviathan of a manœuvre the Whigs have brought against us in the shape of war.

It does not strike me that B. M. has given a very accurate account of what he calls my scheme. He describes it as directed, first, to "force honest Radicals into Parliament by agreements at elections; and secondly, where it is impracticable to get in a Whig, to join in returning a Tory, for the purpose of forcing the Whigs into opposition."

Now without at all desiring to deny that it would be an excellent thing for the public safety if the Whigs were in opposition, my advice was in these words, as taken from the last place where I know where to look for it, the Letter in your paper of the 11th of July last, on the subject of the Dinner to Messrs. Lovett and Collins.—

'In places which send one member to Parliament, see to getting up a candidate of your own, and try your strength, if it is only twenty. When there are to be two members, offer to join with either of the parties of Whigs and Tories to bring in one and one, if you can trust them; but if you cannot, set up two candidates of your own, for there will be little use in one. And perhaps the best way of all is to set up your two candidates first, and then negociate for keeping one back if somebody will join. But have your second candidate ready to re-produce the moment treachery is practised against you.'

I do not think this is exactly represented in the description given by B. M.

The main point for the Radicals (if that is to be their name) to aim at, I hold to be, to show themselves to be somebody and something. If they do not, they are always sure to be what the racing men call "no where." At Marylebone they were *not* "no where;" as the Whigs can testify. It might as well be said that the rock of Gibraltar was no where. They stood like that; and they demonstrated the important fact, that the Whigs would bring in a Tory at a vast expense, in a place where they knew or ought to have known there was not from the beginning the slightest chance of bringing in their own man, and this for the sake of keeping out another whom they could not trust with the political compact they were about to make. B. M. will say, this is what he asserts they always will do when they can; and so far he is right. But what is there to be done, but stand the brunt; offer to combine with

them on fair terms where they are willing, and set our faces like a flint where they will not?

Maidstone had nothing to do with it at all. There was then no split between the Whigs and Radicals. At Maidstone there are 550 liberal voters, and 100 who always sell their votes and turn the scale. These last sent to my leading friends, as I am informed, the night before the election, and said they were ours for five pounds a-piece, and they should ask the Tories eight. There is nothing to laugh at; it is all very business-like and proper. A man once came to Dr. Bowring and said, he wanted to vote for him, but he must charge him a stated sum more, *for being a Unitarian.*

If the Radicals will not do what I recommended, what *will* they do? My advice only amounted to telling them to make themselves something and somebody, and if they prefer being nothing and nobody, what are they to gain by that? Is it that they have got some other way? I cannot see what way, that is not perfectly compatible with what was counselled. The Chartists have tried force, and now they must try something else. But there seems to be no medium between appealing to force, or to the means imperfect as they are, which have been provided for the sake of dispensing with violence. In fact I am at a loss to know, how "the great struggle between aristocracy and democracy" is to be carried on, but in one of these two ways.

I should further be glad to be informed, how a "suffrage movement" is to be conducted so effectually and well, as by "moving" at elections. One thing is no secret, which is that governments can and will put down all movements, as fast as they arrive at a sufficient degree of importance, which are based on other modes. The fact that we have elections by law and by practice, is the weak joint in the harness of despotism; and those who aim their pebble there, are most likely to bring the giant down.

I vehemently doubt the theory, that "the working classes have elevated themselves into a distinct and powerful party." They have the stuff for it; but the thing is all to do. It was simply because to organize themselves for showing their faces at elections, appeared the surest road, that I took the liberty to recommend it.

Whether Household Suffrage is a point to be aimed at, is a mere question of policy. My own belief is, that it is; and that what we gain must be gained in that way. But what is maintained, is, that we should go seriously to work for something, and that elections should be the way. Those who meet in

election committees will be safe; and those who meet in others, are very likely, without any wish of mine, to find themselves, as things go on, among the kangaroos.

Another thing B. M. should take into the account; which is, that even while he was writing his letter the Whigs were changing. They were turning themselves into the puppets of Russia and the rest of the Holy Allies. This has made a fearful difference in their position. They have committed open treason against their engagements of every kind; and the country will reject them. It is not possible to say what shall or shall not be open to the Radicals in consequence; but one thing is clear, that they must be in readiness to act.

Perhaps B. M. will state more distinctly, what it is he wishes the Radicals to do in preference to showing themselves at elections; why he prefers it, and what he thinks the increased chances of its execution.

London, 21 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leicestershire Mercury.

No. I.

WHY ARE WE AT WAR?

SIR,—I gladly improve the permission afforded me, for renewing the communication with the Reformers of Leicester, which I had the honour of establishing in person towards the end of last year.

It would be natural for me to revert to the subjects which then engaged our attention, if there did not unhappily exist a marked difference between that time and the present. We then believed ourselves to be discussing, in peace if not in harmony, the various opinions of individuals, all aimed at one object, the public weal. And little did we surmise the danger, that those inquiries might be swallowed up in the rude, antiquated, agitation of a war.

But so it is. The old peril is upon us. Whether you know it or not, we are at this moment in that condition, where it depends on something like the falling of a die, whether the agitation, uncomfortable enough I dare say to some people, for further reforms in the political and social condition of the community, shall be superseded by inquiries how many French labourers have been killed by how many English, and the ba-

lance held out to us as something to burn tallow about, and give thanks in our cathedrals.

And perhaps you think that all this is coming upon us, in defiance of the best exertions of the men that are at the helm of affairs:—that they are as busy as sailors in a storm, doing everything that can keep them from being driven on this dangerous coast, and that if they ever come there, it will be by the act of God, and we may recover of the underwriters. Nothing of the kind. They are running down upon the peril with their eyes open, as if determined on trying whether the state ship or the rocks are hardest. You will hear nothing about it from the London daily press; because the Radicals have not a daily paper that is not under other influence than theirs; which only makes the obligation of the public greater, to the independent men of the provincial press, who are not afraid to touch the question.

You are to go to war. Do you want to go to war? Such of you as are militarily inclined can always "list." But the rest of you, do you wish for a general war? Will it better any of you, either in substance or in prospect? As far as I can recollect, the men of Leicester did not look as if they could be persuaded to it.

And what is it all for? Has somebody landed from the moon in the Midland Counties? Or is anybody likely to land from any other place? What is it all about, that you at Leicester are to stop what trade you have?

A Sultan and a Pasha have quarrelled, in another quarter of the globe. The Sultan and the Pasha would have made up their difference long ago, but the English ministry sent to them to say they *should not be allowed* to make up their difference, and that it should only be made up as the Holy Alliance chose. The English ministry had been parties to an agreement between this Sultan and this Pasha; which the Sultan broke. And then the English ministers instead of endeavouring to restore things to the footing they were on before, saw an opportunity for getting up a war, pushed on, as it would appear, by a mischievous aristocratical agent they have at Constantinople, who dislikes the Pasha because he has been a great reformer and was "a grocer's son." Here is let out the reason for the whole. It is to be one of the old-fashioned Holy Alliance wars to put down political improvement. The Pasha of Egypt has made his country safe and powerful, while Turkey is going to the dogs through misgovernment. Russia who wants Turkey, wants the Pasha destroyed, because he is the only strong part of the Turkish empire left; and, cunningly

enough, she asks our ministers to do it for her because he was "a grocer's son." France, who was a party with the English ministry to the first agreement between the Sultan and the Pasha, and willingly consented to assist in stopping the Pasha in case, after the convention had been broken, he had tried in his wrath to march to Constantinople, very properly takes it in dudgeon, that this agreement should have been afterwards turned into an agreement to put down the Pasha *because he was not legitimate.* Frenchmen cannot stand seeing people put down for want of legitimacy, if *you* can. They know that all the liberty of any kind they have or you, has come by resistance to this very thing which is called *legitimacy.* And out of all this, our ministers are nursing a war with France.

Of course they will try to tell you, the French are violent, and the French are unreasonable. Do not believe a word of it. The French people have two eyes open, and you have only one. The Tories, meanwhile, are pushing the present ministers to war, and when it is done, they will come forward and say that *they* are the only men to carry it on. Surely some of the cabinet will have the genius to turn out and oppose in time. But if they do not make haste, they may find themselves too late. For as the children's riddle says, when Humpty-Dumpty had fallen off the wall,

> "All the King's horses, and all the King's men,
> Couldn't put Humpty-Dumpty together again."

London, 22 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Manchester Advertiser.

No. III.

WANTS OF MANCHESTER.—SECURITY FOR INDUSTRY AND VESTED CAPITAL.—NOTHING TO BE DONE BY SULKING.

SIR,—I apply myself again to the most important question that can be laid before our friends at Manchester; which is, why they do not set themselves in good earnest to obtaining some substantial security for industry and vested capital, and not leave them at the beck of any two or three people in certain situations, who may be pleased to trifle them away. If thieves were found taking the smallest fraction per cent. from the warehouses or the workshops,—if factory children were discovered in the bad practice of dipping their fingers into the master's grease, and carrying away as much as, scraped

together at the week's end, would exchange for a farthing candle, police and magistrates would be up in arms, and no prevention would be thought too costly or too cumbrous, that might stave off such dreadful consummations. But when the question is of whether a *fiat* shall arrive at seven o'clock some morning by the railway, announcing that those who have speculated may go into the *Gazette ;* that the man who has set up a daily pudding may set it down again ; that those who are in debt may give up the idea of being out, and those who have money owing to them may get it when they can ;—against these evils, so long before they would be matched by the dabbling of all the factory children in the world, they neither have, as it appears to me, any organization, nor mean to have, nor are going anything like the way ever to have. They will watch a farthing's worth of tallow, but the millions which are involved in factories and railroads, may make returns or not as fortune shall decide.

There has been a great political shock and danger, which even if it yet fails to burst upon them in all its violence, has demonstrated that they have got no engineer to their train who has the smallest intent of guiding it in the way the company meant who put him in his place, or if there be any such, they have allowed themselves to be thrust into some store-waggon while the others take their way ; and yet nobody has given any warning, nobody has so much as whispered uneasiness, but everything has been left to Providence, which though it may be a good master to the careful, takes especial pleasure in upsetting the lazy and the thoughtless. Do not you see the explanation? They were all looking and thinking about something else; there was some job to job, or some petty gain to catch, some party to keep in, by whose benevolence the hours of factory children were to be regulated as the masters wished, or the *élite* of Manchester men to hob and nob at some ministerial dinner. But for the great question of questions, whether the trade and industry of Manchester were to go on in peace and quietness, or to be shut out wherever a ship of war or a battery could stop them,—for this, nobody had any eyes, nor has them now ; and to this hour, if it had not been for other watch than theirs, it would never have been heard of at all.

What I want to ask, then, is, where is the party in Manchester who a year ago evinced so stout a disposition to make some amendment, and why are they not stirring and displaying themselves? What was only suspected then, is certain now. The Whig treason to the popular cause is as plain as

the sun in heaven, and needs no more demonstrating. You have set men on your watch-tower, who, if they were not asleep when you set them there, have been asleep since. In all things, *use the means;* from the concerns of an empire, to the boiling of an egg. If your boiler has served your purpose before, you may conclude it will do it again; but if it has not, see to getting another in its place.

The time has positively come for lifting up the hands that hang down. You disliked the Whigs last year; and that you did not make a greater show against them, was owing to divers accidents, which are very unlikely to happen again.

In the first place, you in reality did make an enormous haul upon the Whig strength and power; but it was in a way that did not make much show unless examined into. It was like the effort of a man who has tried to wipe off some fifteen hundred pounds, and fallen short by some hundred and twenty. The effort and the success may both have been great, though not of a kind to make much display. The effect is there, and will all tell another time.

In the next place, your opponents can hardly contrive to have two elections instead of one, whenever it may suit them. Everybody knows how much this accident wrought against your side, as it always must against those who have least money and time to spare.

Thirdly, it is scarcely possible that the Whigs should be able again to take advantage of the perjury of their poll-clerks, who, as was proved by affidavit, from almost the first hour of the poll refused to record votes for your candidate; for which you have no remedy, as there is no remedy for anything in this country by which the people are abused. But the fault was in the main yours, in not having appointed poll-clerks of your own. Engaged as we are with professional sharpers of the first magnitude, we must learn to prevent our teeth from being stolen out of our mouths. And if you did not do it the first time, you must do it the second. With moderate caution, there is very little chance of the same trick being played on you again.

Fourthly, which is the weightiest point of all, your opponents have entirely altered the situation in which they stand before the country. Last year they appeared as feeble, but it might be well-meaning men. The humbleness of their capacities was displayed to you in its nakedness, when they told you that the qualification for a member for Manchester was that he should have made a *cob* or *cop* (which was it?) of cotton; but there was nothing in this inconsistent with the most

infantine innocence. But since that, the ministry they professed to support has gone over in mass to the enemy; there may be grumblers, who it may be hoped will show themselves, but this is what as a corps they have done. After gulling us with "Peace, Economy, and Commerce," they have gone clean over to the Holy Alliance with drums beating and colours flying, and done their best (in which they will be beaten yet) to replace us in the situation we once held, of chief payers for all the evil-doing in the world. The men, then, who supported them before, must either come over to you, or stay where they are. The probability is, that some will do one and some the other. The small men, and the honest, who may be more than would be thought, will be for coming over. The rich will stick like camels in the eye of the needle, and go on as before, looking out for somebody to help them to do nothing. But out of all this, it is plain that great advantages must arise to the party of the movement,—to the party who wish to move away from war, tyranny, and the Holy Alliance of Prussia, Austria, Russia, and Whig, framed to stop reform by quarrelling with France.

Once more let me try to impress on all who dream of amending their condition by political reform, that the thing is not to be done by running their heads into a corner, and declaring that they will sulk there, till heaven sends them what they want. They must do as their fathers did. They must submit to be politicians, and to think that nothing passes in the universal world, which an enemy cannot twist to their harm, or a friend to good. They must permit themselves to be thoroughly persuaded, that the busy men are always taking care of themselves, and that unless they will consent to be busy too, they must be content with so much of the cake as nobody else can swallow.

A strong reason for getting ready now, is that the Whig dynasty, as it was, is manifestly come to an end. There is a portion among them hesitating whether it is best to separate and declare off now, or stay where they are for the chance of what mischief they may prevent. This section, if it plays its cards boldly and well, may survive; but taking the word in its former sense, the Whigs are a *felo de se*. They have done no more than many people expected of them; but they have done what, if well followed up on the other side, ought to advance the popular cause in the next three years, as much as it has gone down in the last.

The great object of the people's enemies just now, is to get up an ill feeling with the people of France. The working

classes of Manchester ought to have too much virtue and wisdom to give into so bare-faced a plot; and anything they could do towards a demonstration that the people of England are not the government, would be most beneficial at the present moment.

London, 22 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Nottingham Review.

No. I.

THE "EASTERN QUESTION."—YOUR INTEREST IN PREVENTING A WANTON WAR.

SIR,—In taking advantage of your permission to address myself to your readers through your pages, I can begin by nothing so useful and important, as endeavouring to support and impress what you have so ably laid down already, on what has got the name of "The Eastern Question."

So bold, and so nearly successful, an attempt at breaking up the peace of the world for sinister purposes, is not to be found in the history of the failures of bad causes. Everything was against the honest party; they were in truth fast asleep, with no more notion of a danger like that which has been so near breaking on them, than of danger from Mount Vesuvius.

The grand point in the game of the English ministers, has always lain, in distracting the attention of the public from the question whether England or France had taken the just side, and fixing it on a dispute whether France had or had not been treated with diplomatic courtesy in the doing. And consequently, when France declares against Holy Alliances at large, and proclaims the principle involved to be what no free nation can or ought to tolerate,—the silly English are expected to think this completely answered, by the ministers asking whether France can possibly deny, that the thing was done with all imaginable civility towards herself.

On this point it is, the grand attempt is made to throw dust into the eyes of the English people. The provincial press has happily raised an opposition, which will stamp its character both at home and abroad; and it would be unjust not to acknowledge the services of the *Morning Herald*, one of the last Sauls that would have been expected among the prophets. But uprightness is of no sect or colour; and the gratification of not having followed a multitude to be

imposed upon, will compensate for the sacrifice of many political partialities. The Whig war is rootedly unjust; and disgraceful for that and two or three other reasons more. It is disgraceful because it is in direct opposition to all engagements entered into; the recruit who enlists and then goes over to the enemy with arms and accoutrements, is not a more manifest deserter. It is disgraceful because it is in opposition to all British interests, and in subservience to those of foreigners, who if they do not pay for what they have received, ought. It is disgraceful because it is a personal attack on an old and firm friend of England and Englishmen, and because it is for the purpose of preventing improvement and restoring barbarism. In fact, as the *Journal des Débats* rightly describes it, it is on all and every point "a barbarian and anti-national act." No government can stand, that is once considered as "barbarian" by those who are to support it.

The ignorance and blindness that have existed on the subject are astonishing. But they are over. It is not easy to mislead a nation permanently, where journals like yours are on the public watch-tower. In France too, the knowledge is spreading rapidly, that the honest, hearty people of England are totally opposed to the proceeding of their ministers,—that, in fact, their feeling is the same as on the grand event of the "Three Days," which crushed the eggs of arbitrary power both here and abroad. The English ministers may sit long on their nest, before they cluck to any chickens out of those shells.

The deep interest your town and neighbourhood must have in preventing a wanton war, is too palpable to enter on. Only let nothing be lost by false security. Even if the danger is past, there is still *the harvest that is to be made of it.* The liberal cause in England was grievously *in want of an event;* and here it is. The Whigs have gone over to the Holy Alliance, *and have failed.*

London, 21 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editors of the Sheffield Iris.

No. II.

THE FRENCH MINISTRY'S ANSWER TO LORD PALMERSTON.—THE HOLY ALLIANCE PRINCIPLE REVIVED.—THE FRENCH NOTE.—THE TREATY OF THE 15TH JULY.

SIRS,—The march of events is so urgent, that, corn or no corn, we must for the moment look after the men who are

firing our house over our heads, and let alone the rats that are in the pantry.

The answer of the French Ministry to Lord Palmerston's Memorandum of Aug. 30, has appeared to-day. The *Morning Herald* (of Oct. 13) gives the fullest account. The *Herald* has two taps; on commercial and economical subjects, its liquor is "too small to give the pigs;" but when it turns the other cock, it can draw something vastly above "intermediate," and laying a decided claim to "stout." On the present question, it has been always in advance of the other London papers, both in its facts and in its arguments.

The answer of the French ministry is one of the finest specimens of the diplomacy of honest men it is possible to conceive. Conciliatory in expression without sacrificing any truth, calm without presenting the appearance of being what upstarts call "dignified," it is the exact copy of what in private life a gentleman would indite, who found himself engaged with a knot of men who he knew were united in an attempt to pick a quarrel with him on a fraudulent basis, in pursuance of some unworthy design upon his reputation and property, or those of his friends. The secret is out, thus far. The English ministry, in the collective note signed at Constantinople on the 27th July 1839, obtained the ready consent of France to an agreement that Mohammed Ali should be prevented from marching on Constantinople; and for the not unsubstantial reasons, that if he did, nothing on earth would hinder Russia from marching 100,000 men upon the same point on the plea of preserving it from invasion, and thus the Russians must either have Constantinople and the Turkish empire, or there must begin that general war between the Liberal and Anti-liberal powers of Europe, which, like death, though it will come at some time, sensible men agree in wishing to procrastinate. But directly afterwards France finds out, that our Whig ministry is turning this agreement into an agreement to put down Mohammed Ali *because he is not legitimate.* France here then, sees a war actually begun against herself, and against the principle on which her liberties and ours exist. We should see as she does, if we had brains in our heads; which we have not. We are a stupid race, rubbing our noses from morning till night against the grindstone, and leaving it at the option of anybody that chuses, to take the returns of our industry from us, to be spent on war against all and everybody that happens to have more freedom or independence than our lords and masters think is of good example for ourselves. We thought we had had enough of Holy Alliance

wars against other people's freedom; and now the devil is up again and at our backs, without our having the smallest machinery at command to hinder it.*

What is the Holy Alliance principle? I thought you knew; but in a quarter of a century it seems the knowledge is worn out. It is simply the establishment of the rule, that when any people or portion of a people, shows signs of making advances in civilization and civil freedom, the other rulers of the earth, whose people have no immediate feeling in the particular cause of quarrel, shall bring them into the field to put down the alteration. It is the principle by which in military affairs, when a regiment of infantry remonstrates against being loaded like jackasses with a heavy knapsack, a regiment of cavalry, which *has no* knapsacks, is brought in to ride them down. It is the principle on which, in every struggle you or your fathers have had for political improvement, the French, Germans, Russians, anybody, would have been brought in to defend the existing wrongs, if opportunity had favoured. And as nobody does anything for nothing, of course the returns looked for by our governors are two;—one, the prevention of bad example upon ourselves, the other the opportunity of appeal to assistance of the same kind if occasion should arise.

You will say, it is impossible and incredible that the occasion should ever come. Be it so; heaven only knows. But you are gross fools if you allow a government which was raised to power on the ground of being friendly to civil and religious liberty, to turn round upon you and put itself at the head of a new Holy Alliance for the preservation of the sovereign rights of Turkey over reforming Pashas. If there is doubt about your government being got to this point, let me give you the conclusion of the leading article of the great ministerial organ of this morning.—

'The European commonwealth cannot fail to look with great jealousy on the advancement of any doctrines calculated to undermine sovereign authority in any part of the world.'—*Morning Chronicle*, 13 *Oct.* 1840.

There you have the Whigs in full Holy Alliance regimentals. There is no doubt about the fact now; they have gulled and cheated you, and taken advantage of your confidence to give you over to your enemies in the dark. And what the principals do, of course the underlings overdo. One of their country journals says, last Saturday, that Mohammed Ali is the Sultan's "slave;" and so your grindstones at Sheffield are to stand still, that a Holy Alliance may prevent a "slave".

from talking with his master in the gate. No man doubts that the "slave," as he is called, has civilized his country and made it a place where life and property are secure; and the object of the Holy Alliance, with your Whigs at its head, is to reduce it to the state of barbarism and blood in which it was before. And for this, you of Sheffield are to contribute out of your savings, instead of putting them into the Savings' Bank.

Let me give you an extract from the French note, that you may see the spirit and tone of it, and be induced to look into the rest if you have the opportunity. The official translation is perhaps a little cramped; but this you must allow for.—

'Let us admit, however, for the moment, that the views of the British Cabinet are better understood than those of the French Cabinet,—is not the alliance of France worth more for the integrity of the Ottoman empire, and for the peace of the world, than this or that boundary of Syria?'

'We should not be so much alarmed for the integrity of the Ottoman empire, were no dread entertained for great changes in the territory of the world; if war were not dreaded, which alone renders these great changes possible. Now, what is the most efficacious combination to prevent them? Is it not the alliance of France and England?—From Cadiz to the banks of the Oder and of the Danube, ask the people. Ask them what they think in this respect, and they will answer that it is this alliance, which for ten years has saved the peace and the independence, without injuring the liberty, of nations.'

'It will be said that this alliance is not broken, and that it will reappear after the completion of the treaty of the 15th of July. When four Powers have pursued, without us, and in spite of us, an end in itself bad,—which we at least believe, and have declared to be so,—when they have pursued it by an alliance, too, similar to those coalitions which, for fifty years, have deluged Europe with blood,—can it be believed that France will be found without mistrust, without resentment at this offence? This would be to form of her national pride an idea which she has never given to the world.'

'They have then sacrificed, gratuitously, for a secondary result, an alliance which has maintained the independence and integrity of the Ottoman empire much more surely than the treaty of the 15th of July can do. It may be said, that France might make the same reflection, and that she could, if the question of the limits in Syria appeared to her secondary, yield to the views of England, and purchase, by that sacrifice, the maintenance of the alliance.'

'To this a very simple answer can be given. France, once agreed in the end with her allies, would have made, not any of those sacrifices which no nation owes to another, but merely the sacrifice of her manner of considering certain questions of boundary. She has proved this by the concessions she has demanded from and obtained from the Viceroy [Mohammed Ali]. But she has been allowed no choice. She was

informed of a new alliance, when that alliance was already concluded. From that moment she was obliged to take up an isolated position. She has done so, but did not do it till then. Since, constantly faithful to her pacific policy, she has advised the Viceroy of Egypt to act with the most pacific moderation. Although armed and free in her action, she will do her utmost endeavour to avoid grief and catastrophes to the world. Except sacrifices which would affect her honour, she will make all those she can to maintain peace, and if she holds this language to the British Cabinet, she does so less as a matter of complaint than to prove the loyalty of her policy, not only to Great Britain, but to the world, the opinion of which, no state at present, however powerful it may be, can despise. The Secretary of State of her Britannic Majesty has been desirous to prove the justice of his conduct: the Secretary of State of his Majesty the King of the French owes it also to his king and country to prove the consistency and the loyalty [*in French*, loyauté *means honesty*, *fairness*] of French policy in the grave question of the East.'

Here then you have a hand-writing which will stand against you from generation to generation, if you allow yourselves to be led by the nose as asses are. You are duped, you are deceived, there is a plot against you; the treaty of the 15th of July was purposely withheld that it might not be in time to come before parliament, and now you are to be pushed into a war with your best friends before parliament can meet again. If you have the spirit which moves a man, after being kicked once, to oppose being kicked again, bestir yourselves. The men of the Three Days in France, are holding out their hands to you, and appealing to the Grand Jury of the world whether they have not shown you a case that ought to make you move. Did you ever know an individual, who stuck to a base, tricky, and dishonest line of conduct, who was not in the end brought to disgrace and misery as the consequence? So it will be in politics. If you allow your country to be made a bye-word in the world for falsehood, tyranny, and popular apathy to the wickedness of its government, depend on it, first or last, you will be brought to ruin. War, and above all, such war as you are now threatened with, is but the shuffling of a hand at whist. All the good cards are in your opponent's hands to begin with, for he has got the good cause, and you the base, discreditable, dirty, and infamous one. All the nations in the earth in their hearts are with him and against you. The world will put down tyranny and Holy Alliances yet; and you among them, if ye be found in that Gomorrah. Remember too, you have internal foes, your landed interest, who have kept down the national strength to a fraction of what it might have been had commerce been allowed, and so far laid you at the mercy of

those you insist on making your just enemies. In all things, consider the end; and why should you allow your rulers to bring on a war, which besides being against your interests, your feelings, and your honour, may end in bringing the nations of the earth to a grand settlement of the world's honest peace in London?

While the French ministry was framing its note, came the news of the brutal attack upon Beyrout; and this induces it to add a short postscript, referring to *another note*, which has not yet reached the Morning Herald. This *other note*, therefore, is now the important thing; and I shall hope to be able to add some remarks upon it, in time for press. The Herald gives a sketch of its contents on private information, which make it of a highly interesting nature: but it will be time enough to discuss them, when the original is at hand.

And now, men of Sheffield, do me the justice to remember, come what will, that I was not one of the "dumb dogs that cannot bark," who never opened their mouths in the way of warning to you while these things were going on,—still less, of those that took a pudding as the price of keeping their mouths close shut. The "dumb dogs" who were so eager to prevent me from standing on the vantage ground of parliament, knew well what they were about, and so do you. But like an honest sentry, though I cannot put an order into the book, I can fire off my piece, be it small or great, that at all events you may have the chance of knowing that something is going on upon your front.

London, 13 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Suffolk Chronicle.

No. II.

POSITION TAKEN BY THE PROVINCIAL PRESS.—POINTS THE PROVINCIAL PRESS HAS BROUGHT TO LIGHT.

SIR,—Since the date of my last letter, a great increase has taken place in the information of the public, on the causes and pretences for this impending war. The provincial press in all parts of the country has applied itself to the question, and has virtually taken a position which it never will relinquish, as a new and separate estate in the expression and direction of national opinion.

Two principal points have been brought to light through its exertions.

One, that the fraud attempted has consisted in trying to substitute the question whether France was civilly treated in the manner, for whether she was justly treated in the substance.

The other, that it is to the moderation and imperturbable equanimity of the French government, we owe all the existing prospect of preserving the peace of Europe.

When France discovered that the convention for preventing Mohammed Ali from marching to Constantinople, had been changed into an agreement for putting him down because he was not legitimate, she had the same cause of complaint that England, to put an imaginary case, would have had if she had found a Treaty for preventing the Hollanders from endangering the peace of Europe by a war on Spain, suddenly changed into a Treaty for putting down the Dutch on the ground of being revolted slaves of the Spanish Crown. The question lies in a small compass. One part of the world is in favour of the success of revolted slaves, and another is against it. We in England are successfully "revolted slaves" ourselves; for if it had not been for the success of our forefathers in what an anti-national church to this day denominates the Great Rebellion, we should have been slaves who had tried to revolt and failed. All the feelings of Englishmen therefore, except the party of slavery, are in favour of the progress of freedom, which enemies call revolt, all over the world. They acknowledge no right in despotism, no *primâ facie* claim (for instance) why the Grand Turk is to put down reforming Pashas struggling to introduce European knowledge and civilization into their respective countries; still less why Englishmen should be made to give their money or blood in aid. Their feelings are all the other way; they love and admire the improvers, they hate and despise, not the less-informed opponents of improvement in the countries concerned, but the depraved politicians at home, who see in the prevention of civilization abroad, some chance of prolonged existence to abuses here.

But if the English feel this, the French feel it more keenly still, as having been engaged more lately in the struggle for national rights, which with whatever variety of fortunes, ended in victory last. And besides this, they were the injured in the present affair. The English were as much injured too, if separation is to be made between them and their ministry; but the French were the people at whom the diplomatic blow was struck. Feeling this with all the keenness of men unaccustomed to ill-treatment, their expression of it was of

necessity forcible and dangerous. And here is to be admired the immoveable calmness of the French negotiators, forming the strongest contrast to the *quàm parvâ sapientiâ* of their opponents. The French negotiators have cautiously abstained from putting forward the strength of their case. And why? They keep it for a later period. They do not desire to inflame the passions of the Holy Allies, by dwelling on the grounds on which the opposition of France is finally rested; the necessity, to wit, of resistance to the often-defeated principle of foreign interference for legitimacy, and the certainty of that resistance being successful, from the strength of parties favourable to it in the interior of the assailants' own countries. This is what the French negotiators reserve. The English liberals will also reserve their speculations on what may be the ultimate consequences here, till greater progress is made in evincing the necessity of producing them.

London, 22 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the True Scotsman.

No. I.

URGENT PRESENT DANGER.—HISTORY OF THE PROPOSED WAR.—FALSIFICATION OF REPORTS.

SIR,—It is with pleasure I receive your permission to begin a correspondence, which shall be honestly dedicated to cultivate the interests which we believe we have in common with your readers.

As I write not for applause, nor even in the main for approbation, I will at once hazard whatever may be the consequences, of saying a huge mistake is abroad in believing, that any substantial difference of interest when well understood, exists among the different classes who are looking to better their condition by political reform.

This may not be a point to be jumped to at one leap. On the contrary, it may be a problem to be come at by a good deal of working. But still it may be true. We will try, with your permission, *at a more favourable time*, to arrive at some conclusion.

But in the meantime there has started up a new and unexpected danger, which twelve months ago nobody would have believed in; and it really seems absolutely necessary to look to that now, that we may have some chance of looking to the other at another time.

You have teased the Whigs with your Reform demands, and the Irishmen with their Repeal, till, what in heaven's name do you think they have done? They have sent and ordered a war cut and dried from Constantinople. There is no joke in it, I assure you; I never had a longer face in my life. They have positively got up a war, where nobody but themselves could have found one. You may all shut up shop, and turn your political unions or what is left of them, into houses where "the bringer of a good recruit will be well rewarded." You are to be employed in cutting other people's throats instead of muttering and grumbling about what you call your grievances. It is the old Roman policy; you have schoolmasters among your readers who can translate—

'Bello deinde civiles discordiæ intermissæ.'

'If this war was *about* anything, then the inference would not be so clear, that it was got up to stop Reform at home; but it is about nothing, save and except the Holy Alliance principle. Your readers know what that was; such of them as are above forty, from personal acquaintance. It was this:—that if you, or I, or anybody, propose to mend the institutions we live under, foreigners shall be brought in, to decide exactly how much we shall be allowed to do, and to put us down with fire and sword if we aim at more.

The history of the proposed Whig war is simply this; as you will find if you can break through the mist which the Whigs and their press are throwing about it. The Turkish Empire, as everybody knows, is tumbling to pieces through the badness of its government and the backwardness of its people. In one portion of the empire, Egypt, a Pasha has for thirty years been introducing European reforms and practices as fast as he was able. He has succeeded so far, that the country which thirty years ago was a nest of barbarians into which nobody thought of penetrating without a couple of battalions for convoy, is now a place that British communications and commerce, so far as British laws will let them, can traverse from end to end. Our women and children from India, trot backward and forward in omnibuses, and expect soon a railroad, where thirty years ago a regiment of cavalry could not have made the passage. But there is one great defect in the man who did all this; he was "a grocer's son." And this the Whig lords who are at the top of things here and at Constantinople, cannot abide. In 1833 a convention was made between the Sultan at Constantinople and the Pasha, settling the countries which the Pasha was to hold; and to

this convention *both the English and French* governments made themselves virtually parties. In 1838 the Sultan took the opportunity, as barbarian governments will, when he thought the Pasha engaged at the other end of the world in Ethiopia, to attack his troops; but he was totally defeated. A danger then arose, that the Pasha in his wrath might march to Constantinople; where, the real truth is, the great mass of the population wish to see him, on the same principle that if an hereditary sovereign of our own was a boy and in the hands of foreigners, we might wish to see Lord Wellington, as the ablest and most successful warrior we have, arrive with the army from India where he might happen to be Viceroy. And as a further proof of this, the Turkish fleet, agreeing that their Sultan was not his own master but in the hands of foreigners, sailed off with one accord to join the Pasha, as an English fleet might sail to join Lord Wellington in the case supposed.

The Sultan himself, poor youth, had the greatest desire in the world to be on goood terms with the Pasha; but he was in durance to foreigners. He sent an officer to Egypt in a steam-vessel to conclude an agreement; and our Whigs with their holy allies, sent to the Sultan to say, *that he should make no agreement with the Pasha but on the terms they should chuse to dictate.* Do you see the state of things, or does it want more explaining?

France had readily consented to be a party in preventing the Pasha from marching to Constantinople; because it was quite clear that Russia, who covets Turkey, would make it a reason for marching 100,000 men on Constantinople, which would probably lead to a general war, and taking it for herself. And France had taken the good and honest way of producing this effect, by remonstrating in a friendly manner with the Pasha, and stating to him the difficulty, and the reasons why he must refrain. But shortly afterwards, France finds to her astonishment, that our Whig ministry has *changed the convention to keep* the Pasha from marching to Constantinople, into a convention *to put down the Pasha because he is not legitimate.* Frenchmen are not such fools as to see their government putting down people for not being legitimate, if *we* are. The French have suffered enough by these battles for legitimacy; and so, one might have thought, have we. But what is plain is, that the French people stand upon the just and honourable side of the question, and the Whigs on the unjust and dishonourable. That the French people are contending for the right of nations to settle their own affairs without the dictation of foreigners; and that our government is struggling to involve

us in a dishonourable and wicked war, with a view to putting us into our old position of

'——the general foe
Of truth and freedom, wheresoe'er they grow,'

and so insuring the destruction of our own prospects of advance in either.

When the last Treaty entered into by the Holy Alliance of Russia, Prussia, Austria, and Whig, was asked for in the House of Commons, it was withheld with the manifest object of letting the House separate without it. The buzz of the supporters of the Whigs at this moment is, that they have contrived so cunningly, as that their bloody work in Syria shall be all done before the French Chambers can meet; and they think the Chambers will take less note of what is past prevention. So much for the system, in both countries, of having a responsible government for half the year, and irresponsible the other. It reminds me (and here I must refer to your schoolmasters again) of the heathen goddess who was to pass half her time in heaven and half in hell. All manner of misrepresentations are put in action against you. Of the Reports made to the government, both those of official visitors and of the accidental residents in the countries concerned, I individually know that what can be turned towards one side of the question is printed and laid before the House of Commons and the public, and what tends the other way is taken out. I know that the real bearing of them all is to say, that though Mohammed Ali's government in Egypt and Syria is far from perfect, it is incomparably superior to anything that ever was there before, and that he is in fact the only man who can carry it on at all. The House of Commons asks for information; and the government gives "Extracts,"—that is, it gives one side. In such miserable estate, are you, and I, and everybody.

Perhaps you knew nothing of all this. If so, you are wiser than you were yesterday. Two things only afford the smallest chance. One is, that there should be a general demand for the assembling of parliament, that, at all events, we may perish with some of the forms of a representative government. The other, which would be the most effective of the two, is that the people of the United Kingdom would without an hour's delay, renew those public indications of fraternal feeling towards the brave and free people of France, which in 1830 broke the jaw-teeth in the mouths of the Holy Alliance of that day, and gave us such Reform as we got, which at all events was better than being trampled down into the mud of Holy Alliance wars.

London, 21 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Bolton Free Press.

No. V.

AN AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION, BUT NOT "ROYAL."—VAN BUREN'S DENUNCIATION OF COMMERCE.—PIRATES AND CORN-LAW MAKERS EQUALLY AVERSE TO HONEST TRADE.

SIR,—Another agricultural meeting like the Buckinghamshire, except that it makes no parade of royal patronage, invites the same kind of examination and retort.

The annual meeting of the "Waltham Agricultural Association" took place on the 16th of October, Lord George Manners presiding.—*Standard*, 22 *Oct.* 1840.

After the toasts and cheers of routine, the Chairman proposes "Prosperity to the Association." He declares that "there was nothing selfish in their composition;" the reason why, being that their exertions "proved equally beneficial to all who were engaged in the agricultural interest." That is to say, there was nothing selfish, because they all helped themselves. Let this argument be borne in mind, when the manufacturers shall be carousing pottle-deep to "The Continuance of a Bounty on Foreign Corn."

"There was one subject to which he wished to allude, the connection between agricultural and manufacturing affairs." You at Bolton are interested in this connection too; of course you will be all attention to what is coming.

"It was too true that men were to be found who taught the people that the interests of the farmer were diametrically opposite to those of the manufacturer."

The allusion must be to those silly persons, who teach the farmer that he has an interest in laying a tax on foreign corn, and the manufacturer has not the same interest and right to lay a bounty. It is too true that there are men who do not see the absurdity and dishonesty of such a doctrine. But the noble president "was sure that none in that room held such sentiments, but discarded them at once as monstrous." And to this the assembled farmers express their assent by "cheers."

It is plain these farmers were sensible honest men. There would be no use in telling them to believe, they were to have a tax against the manufacturers of Bolton, and the manufacrers of Bolton would think their interests not affected by it.

They knew the manufacturers would come round on them with a demand, to have the thing at least tried turn and turn about. If the interest of the farmer and manufacturer are so closely united, that to rob the one to serve the other is a blessing to the party robbed, it must be as true of one side as of the other, and therefore there will be no resisting the manufacturer's demand to try his hand in turn. The man who would doubt this, must be far below the standard both of morals and of intelligence, to which it is to be hoped the farmers of England have attained.

But the paternal counsels contributed by Rutland's absent Duke, though described as "most interesting" and having "elicited frequent applause," can scarcely be held to have maintained the promise of the earlier proceedings. There is a hasty leaning towards American opinions, as conveyed in the notion of some President, that "nothing can compensate a nation for a dependence upon others for the bread which they eat." Depend on it, this President in some shape or other had musty biscuit to sell. It is very well he did not say, that nothing can compensate a nation for the evils of foreign commerce; for what is true of one, is equally so of the other. There can be no doubt that many maxims come from America, highly worthy the attention of hereditary legislators; but there may be some doubt whether this, of all others, was the one to fix on.

For the assertion amounts simply to this. That when the inhabitants of an island have multiplied till they exceed the number which can be fed on the corn produced in the island (in which the clearness of vision will be increased by supposing its extent to be some twenty acres), it is highly impolitic and grossly dangerous to permit those inhabitants to exchange the manufactures which the nature of their island may enable them to produce, for corn from anywhere else. That it is consequently a sacred duty in the owners of the twenty acres, to make laws to prevent this, and to brigade and arm as many of the inhabitants as they can, as the means of ensuring the self-denial of the rest. And that the danger principally arises from the consequences which may be induced, in the event of war between this island and its neighbours.

Now all this might be true enough, if it was a settled point that the island was intended to be a nest of pirates or a den of thieves; but not if it is to be the habitation of honest men, seeking to promote their own happiness, and not the interests of a pirate chieftain. A buccaneer would people his island with no more hands at once than could be provisioned snugly and

without foreign communication; but fathers of honest families would not desire to follow his example. They would be aware, that the great object for them was to maintain their families in comfort, and to have families to maintain. It may be very well for a grenadier to ask his officer's leave to marry; because a grenadier is supposed to be devoted to a peculiar public purpose, to which an unlimited power of propagation would be prejudicial. But free men do not come together to do their lord's pleasure, but their own. And they would know too, that just as much as they made war undesirable to themselves, they laid their neighbours with whom they dealt, under an equal bond to keep the peace. So well is this known, that the same men who plead for the prohibition of foreign commerce as disabling nations for war, oppose its extension equally on the ground of creating a disinclination for it. There is not a buccaneering blockhead either here or in France, that does not wail over the progress made in accustoming Englishmen to like French claret, and Frenchmen to like English cottons, as so much incumbrance to the gallant spirit of mutual throat-cutting at the beck of fools. The argument, therefore, of the peril of commerce, cuts both ways. It shows a reason why not, as well as a reason why. In reality it demonstrates, that one effect balances the other, and the supposed peril is consequently null.

Neither is there anything about a trade in corn being stopped by war, which is not as actually existent in the case of a trade being stopped in figs. When the trade is stopped in corn, masses of the population which used to create the manufactures given for the corn, are thrown out of employ, and in fact go without the corn, or its equivalent in the general market in the forms in which they preferred to take it out. And the same of the figs. A man who is beggared by the destruction of a trade in figs, starves as effectually as if it had been by the destruction of a trade in corn. To say that corn is more a necessary of life than figs, may be an argument for a duke, but not for the man who is to starve. A portion of the population is equally "killed off," whether the trade which previously supported them was in corn or figs.

The argument, therefore, to be good for anything, should be directed against all foreign commerce. "Have no foreign commerce, for fear it should be cut off." As observed long ago, two legs are dangerous for the same reason.

But "the great interests of all the classes in the country are identified with the prosperity of its agriculture," to the extent that anything stolen by the agriculturists benefits the loser;

"and yet there is a wicked league against it actually in existence, whose objects can be accomplished only by the decline of agriculture." That is, there are naughty men at Bolton and elsewhere, wishing to cease being robbed, without the smallest consideration for the decline of the robbers' purses which must be the consequence.

"But the increasing energy of our agricultural societies, and especially, &c.—and *the conviction which I hope is flashing upon the minds of the manufacturing part of the community that their real interest cannot flourish, when, through the impoverishment of the farmer, the home market languishes*—all give me a confidence that agriculture has taken a position *from which she can never again be dislodged.*"

That is to say, the conviction which it is hoped is flashing upon the minds of all the men of Bolton, that their interest cannot flourish unless the farmers rob them, gives confidence that the robbery has taken a position from which it can never be dislodged. Have you found anybody at Bolton, on whom this conviction has begun to flash?

"Let no man think that for the future a supply of foreign corn will be obtained by exchanging our manufactures against it. We must pay for it in British gold."

And is there a man in Bolton thinks there would be any harm in that? Suppose the threat had been, that we must pay for it all in British coffee. Would not it have occurred to every man, that coffee is not got for nothing, but by the exchange of British produce of some kind, and therefore there could be no harm in a transit trade in coffee? And the same with gold.

"I did not allude in my letter of Tuesday last to two subjects of importance—the disease which still exists among the cattle,—and the flagrancy of the means whereby false averages of the prices of grain have lately been obtained, and whereby large quantities of corn (above a million of quarters) have been let loose upon the market, paying a fictitious duty."

The agriculturists represent themselves as suffering under two visitations,—a murrain, and an escape of corn. A million of quarters are in the stomachs of the eaters, without having first paid toll to their injustice. The men of Field Lane, which is the London mart for stolen pocket-handkerchiefs, will be next found complaining of a million of bandanas being irregularly in the pockets of the public. One plea is quite as good as the other, and one has as much inherent right to attract parliamentary notice in the next session.

A fear is finally expressed, that "it will be difficult to grapple with it, so as to arrive at, and in any way control, the root of the evil." The root of the evil is in the timidity, the ignorance, and the disunion, of the industrious classes; who till they mend, will be fit subjects for abler men to grind.

The desirableness of noticing this subject while it was fresh, though at the expense perhaps of some irregularity, caused it to be preferred at the present moment.

London, 29 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXXV.

ENGLAND AND FRANCE.—THE "GOOD REFORMERS."—THEIR QUESTION OF CASUISTRY.—WHERE SHALL A LIE BE LOCATED?

SIR,—The extracts and commentaries presented by the ministerial organ, from the later declarations of M. Thiers in the *Constitutionnel*, hold out temptation to remark, and particularly to that kind of examination which consists in seeking analogies upon the other side, and occasionally reversing the position of the contending parties.

'There is, in France, a party which desires war at any price, whether the moment have arrived or not—whether the means of supporting the war be ready or not—whether there be sufficient reason for declining it, or whether the interests and honour of the nation, being satisfied, leave no fair pretext for entering upon it. All are alike to this party. Its aim is war, war not for national advantage, but to change the dynasty and the government. It looks upon war merely as the means of internal revolution. Such a party as this, government can hope neither to convince nor to satisfy.'—*Translation from the Constitutionnel. Morning Chronicle of* 22 *Oct.* 1840.

And what have we in England analogous to this? Have we no party that desires war at any price, whether a time when war is just or necessary has arrived or not, whether the country is in a condition to pay the taxes already incurred for old enjoyments in the way of war, and whether the end and object of the war are not intrinsically dishonourable and such as the morals and feelings of the country equally revolt at? We know well where to look for it. We see and meet it everywhere. Truly may it be said, all are alike to this party. Its aim is war, war not for national advantage, but to change and pervert the progress of reform and liberal ideas. It looks upon war merely as the means of internal retrogradation. Such a party as this, honest men can hope neither to convince nor satisfy, but only to put down.

'On another side stands not a party, but a group of people, who are also for war at any price—that is, a war against the present cabinet, which they accuse of being absurdly warlike whenever it shows firmness, and of being pusillanimously pacific when it acts with prudence. Whatever ministers do, these people find it wrong. We need not reply to such systematic opponents.'—*Id.*

Here too, the English analogy is easily found. We have our party who are for war, whatever it may cost; not from enmity to, but from love of, "the present cabinet;" men who consider themselves as bound up in a joint-stock company with "the present cabinet," and think a war or anything else a light thing to indulge its fancy with, sooner than give a shake to the general concern. And here lies the depth of misery of our condition. We are in the hands of men who reason thus;—"Between two great political parties in the state, there is or has been some shade of difference; we, therefore, will support the best; and as an earnest of its keeping in the right course, we will give it clearly to understand that it may quit the course as soon and as far as it pleases, and it shall have no resistance from us, because it was once the best." This is the argumentation, upon which those who were entrusted by liberal constituencies with the guardianship of peace, economy, and justice, have with no marked exceptions which it is easy to point to, betrayed the cause they undertook. The most decided instance, was perhaps in the Chinese disgrace. When this meanest of degradations was inflicted on the country, the Tories or some of them opposed. On which those pests of honest men, the "good reformers," immediately replied, "*You* oppose, with a view to turn out; therefore *we* shall support, to keep in." By the same rule there is no portion of the decalogue which the existing ministry might not have successively proposed to break, with the certainty of having the full and hearty support of the party rejoicing in the name of "good reformers." Is further evidence wanting, that in the hands of such a class, control is null, and the ministry of their love enjoys an immunity for mischief, which wants nothing but time to nurse it to any extremity of evil known in history?

'But we address impartial men, whether favouring the Cabinet or not, men who desire war merely for the sake of preserving intact the honour and interests of France. Let these men reply to the following arguments.'—*Id.*

In England too, it is possible to address impartial men; men who are prepared for war when it is necessary to preserve their country from injury or disgrace, as they are prepared to act in defence of person and property against individual

robbers; but prepared too to act as towards those same robbers, against such as for dishonest interests would plunge them into the evils of discreditable war. There *is* a race of men in England, to whom an argument may be addressed.

'A treaty was signed, which left France out of the settlement of the Eastern question;—should war have been declared on this account immediately?'

'We reply, that to have declared it merely on account of the treaty being signed, would have been criminal and mad, first because the military state of the country was not such as could meet or carry on war; secondly, because the treaty was an act of which, the consequences only possible, but not certain, might have been a serious motive for war. In presence of such eventualities, what could have been done but arm—arm, with indefatigable activity?'

'Can the government be censured for any remissness in this respect? Has it lost time? It armed, and its duty was to do no more.'—*Id.*

These are the reasons of the French government for not acting with more haste; their apology to those who may be disposed to charge them with procrastination. And we too have our account, of what was doing on the English side.

The English ministry made a convention or a treaty. There is no use in disputing names and terms; they made an agreement, to which they pledged the honour and veracity of the nation, so far as in their hands. This agreement they dishonestly broke, by making another of a directly contrary tendency on an essential point. And then they present themselves to the country, as men bound by the sacred duty of fulfilling engagements.

Here then is a point of casuistry, presented to admiring Europe. A private individual pledges his word to a certain engagement, and directly breaks it and makes a contrary. Is he holden as a man of honour and a gentleman, to the first engagement or the second? Seeing that he is in the unhappy situation that he cannot keep either one or the other without a falsehood, where does his honour require of him to locate his lie? Does his integrity demand of him that he shall keep engagement number one, and thus manifestly perjure himself on number two; or does it prick him on to keep the second and break the first, by virtue of the sacredness of an engagement. It is understood the "good reformers" are running up and down the country in agonies of zeal, to show that moral and virtuous men should chuse the last.

The whole effort of the "good reformers" is directed to misleading the public attention from the substantial circumstances

of the case, and directing it on something else. The grand fact is, that England agreed to a convention of arrangement in the East in conjunction with France, and then sneakingly and disgracefully broke it, avoiding, like a guilty thing, even so much as giving France the cognizance of the fact. It is for this that the men who by the treachery of our so called liberal representatives have unfortunately the character of the country in their hands, are arraigned at the bar of public opinion; and it will require all the effrontery of those who have enticed them into the peril, to take them out.

Room would fail, for going through the whole of the French declaration. But the conclusion of the English ministry as given by their own organ, is worth preserving.—

'We have no wish to dispute him there [*Mohammed Ali in Egypt*], provided he reigns by his own right, his own strength, and his own forbearance. But the moment it is understood that Mohammed holds Egypt chiefly by virtue of French protection and guarantee, then let him look to himself, for England will acknowledge no such guarantee.'—*Morning Chronicle*, 22 *Oct.* 1840.

See what school-boys have the arrangement of our destinies. England is not to admit of France's supporting the first agreement to which both she and England were parties; but France is required to submit to England's unjust interference in defiance of pledge given. It is simply the case of a brutal and dishonest school-boy trying to bully an honourable and well-behaved. And for all this you and I are to pay, by loss of commerce and increase of taxes now, and by all that may result when the nations are moved to march upon us as the world's nuisance, the "sea-girt bully" and general enemy of mankind.

London, 28 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leicestershire Mercury.

No. II.

DEFENCE OF THE WAR MINISTRY.—THEY MUST PROTECT MASTERS AGAINST THEIR VASSALS.—"CROTCHETS!"

SIR,—The *Sun* of last night (Oct. 28) gives a lengthened notice to the letter from me which appeared in your paper of the 24th instant.

It begins by being sarcastic on "the position, the habits, the pursuits, and the studies" of your good men of Leicester; with apparently the intention of impressing on them, that the

question of war or peace is one on which they ought to shut their eyes and open their mouths, and see what ministers will send them.

If there were errors in the facts or the reasonings advanced, it is right they should be shown. But there seems nothing in the argument founded on sarcasms against the people to whom they were addressed, which is not common to the worst of causes.

As little of positive force is there in the jest about the men of Leicester looking "white in the gills." If the men of Leicester will do me the honour to refer to what was written, they will see I said, they did not look as if they could be persuaded to be made fools of. Gibes and jests like these are specimens of the way in which men are to be driven into a senseless war, against their interest and their respectability.

A complaint appears to be intended, that in asserting that the Radicals had not a daily paper not under other influence than theirs, the words were omitted "except the *Sun*." Now it is plain the test applied to Radicalism was, having opposed the renovation of the Holy Alliance principle in the hands of the ministers. The provincial press has done this; and if the *Sun* has done it also and been overlooked, it has ample opportunities of setting the mistake to rights.

The *Sun* is not satisfied with our version, and gives its own. It has quite a right to do it; and so have we to comment.

'The vassal of an empire whose integrity five of the greatest powers in Europe deem essential to the peace of the world, by a series of aggressions strips his master of the most valuable provinces of his dominions."—*Sun*, Oct. 28, 1840.

Integrity, in the sense of reasonable people, was integrity against external violence. In this sense only, is it possible to guarantee the integrity of a rotten turnip. Interference against internal fermentations, is what nobody dreamed of till the time came for making it a pretext. As for stripping "his master," sensible men and free have abnegated that cant. The world is not governed by "masters," but by the interests of the people who live in it.

'Remonstrances are addressed to him in vain. Here under the pretext of suppressing heresy—there under pretence of punishing robbery, and exacting tribute to fill the Imperial exchequer, he contrives to carry on a constant and ruinous system of warfare, indirectly against the enemies of order, but in reality against his master. In self-defence, the Sultan is constrained to take up arms, and the interference of France,

after the battle of Koniah, only saves his capital from destruction. A peace is agreed upon, but though kept in Syria by the vassal, it is broken everywhere else. The finest Turkish provinces on the confines of Bagdad, and the banks of the Tigris, are overrun; the Holy Cities forcibly detained; and though actual war was not carried on in Syria, a system of underhand corruption and intimidation was established, the baneful influence of which extended from the mountains of Lebanon to the shores of the Bosphorus.'—*Id.*

These terms "master" and "vassal" will be the death of us. We know nothing of "masters" and nothing of "vassals." We have just as much to do, with the shares of conjugal benevolence bestowed on the several inmates of the Seraglio. The single point, beyond the invasion of a foreign force, in which a British government could set up a pretence to interfere, would be the case of the Viceroy's attempting to march on Constantinople. The *Sun* declares directly afterwards, that in this the British government ought not to have interfered, but have let things take their course. How much less, then, ought it to have interfered, when this, which was the only event in which British interests could be shown to be even remotely involved, was not attempted.

'The Sultan was as zealous a reformer as his vassal—he was even more so; but the influence of that vassal in Constantinople was sufficient, by means of such tools as Khosrew Pacha, the old Vizier, to neutralize the most meritorious designs of the brave, liberal, but unfortunate Mahmoud. When, therefore, before the battle of Nezib the Sultan again took the field, he was only ostensibly the aggressor. The real aggressor was Mohammed Ali, whose conquest of Adana was entirely unprovoked by the Sultan.'—*Id.*

The truth was, that the Viceroy of Egypt was considered as the real depository of the power of the Turkish empire. After the death of the late Sultan in particular, his successor was considered as entirely in the hands of foreigners; and the Turkish fleet in consequence sailed to join the Viceroy, as an English fleet might have sailed to join Lord Wellington and the army in Spain, if the English throne had been found in a similar predicament. This has been always the secret of "the influence of that vassal in Constantinople."

'Colonel Thompson says that after the defeat at Nezib, the Sultan and his vassal would have made up their quarrel if England would have let them. No doubt of it. But in what way? They would have exchanged titles. Mahmoud and his heirs would have been declared the vassals of Mohammed Ali. The Viceroy of Egypt would have proclaimed himself the independent Sovereign of all his vast conquests, and the Osmanlis would have been suffered, as long as might suit the plea-

sure of Russia, to reign monarchs of Constantinople and its vicinity for some twenty miles on the Stamboul shore of the Bosphorus.'—*Id.*

If they *had* exchanged, where would have been the harm? The *Sun* itself subsequently admits there would have been none. Suppose the Turks prefer Mohammed Ali for a ruler, because they think he can preserve their national independence against Russia and the truly-begotten Sultan cannot,—why are the people of Leicester to consent to be taxed to hinder it? The only excusable object of British jealousy, the securing of Turkish independence against the views of Russia, would be promoted instead of hindered. The Whigs maintain that Turkish independence consists in being under the boy Sultan, to whom they may dictate when he shall agree with what they call "his vassal," and when not.

'In taking the part she did, England never once thought of the obscurity of Mohammed Ali's origin. Whether he were the son of a "grocer" or the son of a King made no difference to her; and indeed the history of British dominion in the East is not wanting in proofs that Kings' sons have rarely met with more consideration than the offspring of castes less considerable than the shop-keepers and tax-collectors of Albania. English statesmen are not such fools as not to know that in a country where there is no hereditary aristocracy—where it is office that confers rank, birth has no more to do with royalty than it has with the motion of the heavenly bodies. It is the mere cant of our deceiving and self-deceived political astrologers, who assume to themselves the cognomen of Radicals *par excellence*.'—*Id.*

When did England tell the *Sun* what "she never once thought"? The outcry against Mohammed Ali was, that he was not legitimate. The voices of his countrymen (for he had no magic to proceed without them) called him to power, but England had Holy Alliance principles to maintain. The allusion to India is most unhappy. Neither kings' sons nor any others, have justice there. The contemptible principle of English policy in India is, to set up the illegitimates when it suits, and when they cease to give satisfaction, pull them down again with loud outcries against their illegitimacy. Thus the Peishwa was established by British force, against the efforts of a portion of his countrymen who contended for the legitimate. But when the Peishwa afterwards gave offence, a British general was directed to "accomplish the restoration of the legitimate sovereign of the Mahrattas," and Mr. Canning stood up in the House of Commons and said, "It had been the policy of Britain, in all her transactions in those countries, to adopt this simple mode of punishing usurpers."—*Mr. Canning in the House of Commons, 4 March*, 1819.

'Had Colonel Thompson undertaken to convince the people of Leicester that it would have been wiser on the part of our government to have allowed Mohammed Ali to seize the Ottoman throne, and reign himself in Constantinople, we would have felt no inclination to quarrel with him. It may be that the dynasty of the Osmanlis is worn out, though the fact cannot be supported by arguments drawn from the conduct of Mahmoud and Abd-ul-Medjid. But even in that case, the question did not rest for solution with England. France claims the merit, if such it be, of having saved Constantinople after the battles of Koniah and Nezib from the victorious arms of the Viceroy. Then there was Russia ready to pounce upon her prey at the first approach of the Pacha. England had no choice in the adoption of her present policy, but to consent to the division of Turkey between Russia and the Pacha by remaining professedly neutral, or take the part which she has done. The only error of our Government was in signing the treaty a little too precipitately—an error which, in wounding the self-love of France, mainly contributed to the present isolated condition and menacing aspect of that Power. So much for the incorrectness of facts and views which we should have thought Colonel Thompson wholly incapable of entertaining, did we not know how apt a set of crotchets are to run away with men's wits on questions much easier of clear comprehension than the oriental policy of the Four Powers.'—*Id.*

The Pasha was Turkey; except in a Holy Alliance view. The Turks say he is the best Turk left, and therefore their fleet sailed to join him. But these things are to be settled by Holy Alliances, and it is not for vassals at Leicester to pry.

The rest of the argument of the *Sun* appears to be included in the word "crotchets." This word is nearly the only defence of the Whigs, and of course their defenders adopt it. "Crotchet," according to Johnson, is "a perverse conceit; an odd fancy." The statement therefore is, that to oppose a war in support of Holy Alliance principles, is "a perverse conceit, an odd fancy." To object to endangering a general European war of opinion, is "a perverse conceit, an odd fancy." More perverse and odd still was probably the conceit, that those who gave assurance to ministers that no possible misrule should forfeit their support, laid the axe to the root of popular control, and introduced us to a despotism. One thing only could be more conceited and more odd; and that was that men with "the position, the habits, the pursuits, and the studies" of the inhabitants of Leicester, should dream of having an opinion whether a war about nothing was good for them or not.

London, 29 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Manchester Advertiser.

No. IV.

On finding Employment for a Superabundant Population in War.

Sir,—In a provincial newspaper, I met to-day with the extraordinary assertion, that "some Radicals were in favour of war because it would give employment to a superabundant population." I therefore take the liberty of entering on the examination of this odd theory of what is expedient and wise; in hope of attracting notice to a variety of other fallacies so much akin to this, that one exposure may do for all.

Employment is to be given to the superabundant population, suppose of Manchester;—that is to say, to the population whom the previously existing state of the laws would not permit to support themselves by the sale of their produce;—to the population who are wandering about crying, "We are eager to work, and could make a number of useful things, but the lords of the bread-basket have so ordered it, that we cannot get for our work as many crumbs as will keep soul and body together;"—or who if they should not be to be found in Manchester, are undeniably found pressing upon us at all corners everywhere else.

For these, or such of them as have the limbs and inches, employment is to be found by war. That is to say, they are to be taught to prime and load, instead of to card and spin, and in return for this they are to receive bread, meat, shelter, and a suit of clothes. They who had none of these good things before, or none in sufficiency, are to have them now. Is not this a wonderful political invention for improving the national condition?

It is wonderful enough to be swallowed without resistance, by a large portion of those who set up for either teachers or learners in the present day; and yet there ought to be nothing in it that should mislead for an hour the intelligent working classes. Where does all this new provender come from? It is bought with the taxes. Can he that pays the taxes spend the amount over again for himself? No. Then if he pays for a soldier's jacket more, he must buy a jacket for himself less, or something equivalent? Most certain. And the same for the soldier's dinner? None can doubt it.

The payer of the new taxes then must suffer. And this,

you will say, may be set off against the comforts to the new soldier. But is this the end?

If there were a number of passengers on shipboard with a limited quantity of provisions for the voyage, and some who had previously been on short allowance were put on full, it is clear that what was thus added to them, could only be taken out of what was got by the others. In the same manner so long as the corn in the country is to be limited to what can be raised upon the landlord's acres, it is plain that if soldiers and soldiers' horses are to be fed where they would not have been before, their food must be taken out of what will be got by somebody else. In other words, the price of corn must rise in comparison with wages to those who continue at work; which means the working man getting less corn for an hour's work, or giving more hours for the same corn.

If the men in work are told they should be only too glad to share their small loaf with those who are out of employ, their answer will be, that they could do it now if they chose; and because they are not moved to consent to it now, they owe no thanks to anybody who should force them to it whether they will or no.

Here then is the end of the "war-employment" delusion. Yet how many a man that passes for wise, shall chuckle over it, and nobody find out that he is no better than a goose. What a subject for parliament; worthy almost of exaltation into a King's Speech!

These considerations will not be without their use at the present moment, if they prevent one man from talking nonsense or another from being led by him, on the question of plunging us into a dishonourable and anti-commercial war, in support of high rents at home and monopoly abroad.

London, 29 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Nottingham Review.

No. II.

WHAT A COURT KNOWS OF THE SERIOUS BUSINESS OF MANKIND.

SIR,—There is little to add to my last letter, except that the danger thickens. As the stars in their courses fought against Sisera, they have fought against the peace party in the cabinet, by cutting off one-half of it in the person of Lord

Holland. Might there be a distant hope, that come of the present plot what may, the nation, or the reforming part of it, will learn a lesson on the desirableness of instituting a really representative government, and not leaving the country for half the year at the mercy of a court and its dependents?

I have said a court and its dependents, because as the preservation of the present ministry in power was notoriously the effect of court preference, it is clear that at this moment the slightest wind of court disfavour would be ruinous to them; from which the conclusion follows, that they are dependent on the court. We are therefore in that situation and no other, in which are the inhabitants of any other country where the court is all in all. But courts take no cognizance of the serious business of mankind, still less of such as may be matter of life and death to *you*. Of *stockings* they know nothing, but as a handsome leg may be inside; and *lace* enters into their imaginations, only as a garnish to the bosom that may be beneath. Little reck they of war or peace, but as there shall be royal entertainment in the decking of many a Joseph in a coat of many colours for his grave, and great curiosity whether the killers or the killed stood tallest without their shoes. That there are people behind to pay and to suffer, no more enters royal heads, than the wear and tear of chess-men does those of the players of the game. This we have been accustomed to suppose was the state of foreign countries where the government is avowedly monarchical and despotic. It would be folly there, to think of checking the royal game by considerations of meaner objects. But men thought, at least some thought, that here some greater provision for the public safety had been established. See what a conspiracy of "good reformers," and bawlers for "keeping out the Tories" while they were bargaining with the Whigs for no resistance, have brought the Reform cause to at last. Here is the ending of the turmoil and the trouble; but who can help it now? The "good reformers" hooted down whoever would have told you of the danger.

It has often occurred to me as strange, that nobody saw the perils of this process;—that nobody resisted it, among other things, as utterly anti-monarchical and revolutionary. Had anybody gone about to frame an attack on the existing order of things, and been free from all apprehensions of consequences from the action of the law, in what more business-like manner could he have proceeded, than by contriving so palpable a demonstration of the inadequacy of the supposed popular checks, for producing so much as one public debate

and hearing, to the extent of what would be required to reduce a corporal for intoxication in his barrack-room? BENTHAM might have philosophized for a score of lives, and run as many divisions on the constitutions that were or were not in the Abbé Sieyes' pigeon-holes as there are changes in a kaleidoscope,—before he could have turned out a demonstration so popular, so convincing, so going home to the eyes and ears and thence to the "hearts and bosoms" of all classes of society, that the thing we have trusted in is naught;—that it can protect nobody and nobody can protect it;—that we have been in a fool's paradise all our lives, and there wanted only the destroyer to come in the right way, in the right month, and knock at the right gate, to turn us with the world before us, to seek our state of rest in any despotism we might chuse to call it.

If anybody had laid down a plan for doing this, and headed it with "Here beginneth the first chapter of the Book of Revolutions," he would have done a sensible deed, as far as the choice of his title was concerned. And the thing has gone so far, that it will be in vain to think of suppressing the edition. The dangerous secret has been let out, and those who do not act on it this year will do it next. The country has no representative government but while partridges are in the shell. When "the young birds are strong on the wing," responsibility begins to quail; and when "the coveys are numerous and large," the admirers of popular control must lay aside their jealousies, till the season of love once more returns the cock partridge to his mate.

London, 28 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editors of the Sheffield Iris.

No. III.

THE FACTORY FRAUD.—DEATH OF LORD HOLLAND.

SIRS,—Though I had determined on not risking the charge of aiding to glut your literary market with discussions on the Corn Laws at the present time, you must allow me to introduce to you from the *Morning Advertiser*, the ablest exposure of what I will denominate the Factory fraud, which it has been my fortune to see. It is very likely this is not the road to popularity; because the very apparition of the fraud is a proof the enemy thought it likely to be popular. But times are at

that pass, that there is no stopping to ask whether the truth is pleasant.

'Language cannot furnish a censure more condemnatory of the political system of England, nor a panegyric more commendatory of the industrial character of its people, than is to be found in the fact of a law against the importation of corn being allowed to remain on the statute-book, while the Legislature is at the same time shamed into the enactment of laws prohibitory of the operative from taxing his strength beyond his natural effort in the desperate struggle to maintain an unpauperised existence. The picture is one at which posterity will look with horror and astonishment. On one side the Legislature preventing them from labouring to the excess to which their necessities would goad them, in the desire of obtaining by their own exertions the most stinted necessaries of life. To object to the limitation of labour prescribed by the Factory Laws, would be considered to evince an inhuman indifference to the sufferings of our over-wrought operatives; but to support the corn laws, which are the accursed cause of these sufferings, is by the landlords pretended to be the most patriotic act of which a generous mind is susceptible. It is, certainly, a most anomalous proceeding for the Legislature, first to resolve that the operative shall not have food below a certain price, and then to resolve that he shall not labour to the extent necessary to pay the cost to which the law has raised his sustenance. The most barbarous despotism never acted with more ill-reasoned and capricious controul of human action than is exemplified in this prostitution of authority to results so diametrically opposite.'—*Morning Advertiser*, 6 *Oct.* 1840.

Here is a bold and well-measured blow against one of the most flagrant instances on record of a people's imbecillity. A race of artisans is cut off by the interested persons from the free exchange of their labour, and forced thereby to exchange three hours' work instead of two for a given quantity of food at the permitted shops. And then, so feeble is the popular mind, so easily diverted from following the scent of injury, that it absolutely blesses the individuals who come forward to declare, "We have made you give us eighteen hours' work for the corn of twelve; and now see what we'll do for you. We'll pass a law, that none of you shall work more than twelve hours a-day. It is quite enough; you must not be cruel to yourselves, or children either; do not let an irrational desire for corn, like the irrational desire for business which haunts your masters, induce you to work more than would be for your health. We know your industrious dispositions; but we can't consent. We get your twelve hours' labour for two-thirds the corn; and our consciences would be uneasy if we thought you were over-working yourselves besides."

There is no denying that to this poorest of all fallacies the

working classes of England have completely yielded. There have been symptoms here and there, of resistance to other fallacies; but none, that I know, of a working population that did not bow to the earth in thankfulness to the good, dear men, who hindered them from over-working to try to escape from being over-starved.

Several reasons may be given, which helped this general result. The men who cried out for one part of the performance, were not the same who cried out for the other. They presented themselves as relieving angels, coming on a mission of more than human kindness, and not having the smallest responsibility for the existence of the evils they came to cure. "Poor over-worked men! Would keep their families if they could! Pretty children, pretty children, are n't they? Pity they should be over-worked, is n't it? Only get sixpence a-day; poor things, poor things! Want to get ninepence: must n't let 'em. Ninepence, too much; work twelve hours for sixpence, can't let 'em get ninepence! Would make them very unwell. Factory Act to prevent more than twelve hours. Ten hours' bill better still. Factory masters won't agree to ten hours' bill. Fathers of families some oppose it. Shocking fathers, shocking families, I dare say. Shocking scene altogether, lower orders!" Such is a specimen of the twaddle by which the grinding of the faces of the working classes is effected; and the laughable thing, if it was not too sorrowful an affair, is that the working classes give in to this, and would be very likely to want to eat up the man who told them they were made dupes and fools.

There is no doubt the result is considerably helped, by the fact of children being concerned. If men were attacked in their own persons, they would be better able to protect themselves; but when the assault is through their children, it finds their weak side. Suppose then, your child was stopped on the highway, and robbed, for instance, of its shoes; and then comes a sleek confederate, who without making the smallest offer to assist in recovering the stolen articles or tracing out the thief, is very urgent that you will not let that poor child walk above two hours at a time. Would not the better way have been, to hinder the stealing of the shoes; and does not your own sense inform you, that any danger there is that you, the father, should want to damage the child's feet, arises out of the act of the first of the associates, who took away the shoes?

The *Morning Advertiser* justly calls the Factory Act, the compromise of a felony;—and a beggarly compromise it is. It is like stealing a horse's corn, and then tying up his head to

hinder him from hurting himself by looking for it. It will be a long time before a horse thanks anybody for doing him either of these good turns; but everybody cannot have the "natural gift" of a horse.

London, 21 *Oct.* 1840.

P.S.—23 Oct.—The sudden death of Lord Holland, which occurred yesterday, will, I am afraid, be decisive of war. On such mere accident is a nation dependent, which consents to live without a representative government. The only perceptible chance left, would be in a public cry for Peace and Lord Clarendon; and that, I am afraid, the public is too much bought and sold to make.

To the Editor of the Suffolk Chronicle.

No. III.

Gross Outrages perpetrated, but not by the People.

Sir,—Your correspondent J. G. quotes William Howitt as saying "We are daily perpetrating the grossest outrages;"—and so we are, in one sense if not in another. If the same course was taken, we should be daily perpetrating the grossest highway robberies. That is to say, if the honest men lived in the same terror of the knaves, and were equally shy of joining together to put them down.

It is not true that we are all robbers, murderers, tyrants, or disposed to be. Great numbers among us are honestly-inclined, well-disposed persons, having no notion of cutting a man's throat for their convenience, nor of driving him into a corner and pouring opium down his stomach because they happen to have the drug to sell. Saving perhaps a little giving in to the nonsense played off under the terms of patriotism, glory, and other rogues' stalking-horses, the middle classes and the steadier of the operatives, are nearly free from this contamination. But we have an upper caste, who scorning honest industry in all kinds, look only to robbery and blood as the means either of amusement or of gain. They are the same men they were in the days of cow-stealing and border robbery. And *we* represent the honest lowland "wabsters," who though much less picturesque it may be than their adversaries, succeeded in putting down the robber trades, to an extent that leaves us an example and a ground for confidence.

Is there no instilling into the mass of the community, that when the "higher orders" speak to us of honour, they almost

invariably mean something extraordinarily shameful and discreditable? And the certainty is doubled, if they are found tacking the word "national" thereto. Be most assured *then*, that something involving personal disgrace to all concerned, is the thing in their minds;—that some compound of meanness, cowardice, cruelty, and unmanliness, is what they are inviting us to handle. And this not after some romantic scale, or impracticable fantasy; but by the rules which united man, free from the impulse of dishonest personal interest, has agreed in laying down for the honourable and the worthy. What an incredible shabbiness there is in all our betters recommend to us! What an absence of all that an honest ambition would prompt to follow or engage in! Our situation is much like that of the better kind of Arabs, who by no fault of their own have been born in a piratical tribe. There is always a strong "under-tow," as the Americans would call it, of honest and well-disposed men in such situations, who are conscious of the superiority of industry and regular labour as the means of private and public prosperity. But they were born under a dynasty of thieves. And what these thieves bring upon them, in the way of suffering for national crimes, they must submit to; and so must we. Our ministers rage for war, expecting red ribbands and various enjoyments from the same. But if the scale should turn against them, as how do they know it will not,—and if, for instance, our country should be ten years occupied by foreign troops, as would only be a just punishment in the gross for the public crime,—it is we, not they, who must endure the suffering. The ministers can order a prayer or two against those who would "swallow us up quick," say God has not heard us—as why should he hear such villains,—and take themselves off whither they like best. But it is we and our children who must face the mischief, and stand the brunt of all they have brought us to.

Two men stand and fire at one another, with an understanding that the survivor shall take all the halfpence in the other's pocket. Is this the act of a sane being, in the one that begins the fray? But we are told we are affronted; and by this plea we are expected to be led to the sacrifice of every principle which we or our forefathers counted honour, to do the will of avowed enemies to all we love and venerate. Our knaves are getting the better of us, just as they would get the better on the highway if we were equally supine. But on the highway, we first catch our knave, and then we hang him. There will be no good, till something like the danger of this discipline is extended to the ampler case.

The controlling of the higher order of mis-doers, is in truth free government. It consists in the subjection of the class who have by nature and by practice the least morals and the least consciousness of right and wrong, to restraint from the sounder portions of society and those who must abide the consequences of misrule. Does anybody believe, that unaided by this control, the gaudier and more imposing classes have as much sense or virtue as should direct a quarter sessions? All history proves they have not.

The good effect which may be hoped from the late and present state of things, is that moral and religious men of the class to which "J. G." belongs, will break through the clouds which have been thrown around them, and acknowledge the interest they have in the worldly thing called politics; being no other than the art and power of enforcing obedience to moral laws, on those who would be the great enemies of mankind without.

London, 28 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the True Scotsman.

No. II.

NO DISCORDANCE OF INTERESTS AMONG HONEST MEN.—PARALLEL FROM A PUBLISHING ESTABLISHMENT.

SIR,—The great probability of an Anti-Reform war which was the subject of my last, is only one instance of the way in which public concerns are left for anybody to damage that feels the wish, and this simply through the absence of any provided and regular organization for carrying on the public business in the direction of the public interest. And what I next engaged to attempt, was to show that there really is no discordance of interests on the subject of the means to be taken for amendment, among the different classes into which *honest* society can be divided.

If in the establishments combined for the publication of your Journal, no general principles were acknowledged for keeping people in the track that should lead to that conclusion, —how certain would be the non-attainment of any useful ends which might have been expected from the whole. Suppose, for example, that while the proprietors were thinking with quiet satisfaction on their prospects of increasing the general circulation of the work, a thing evidently desirable to all con-

cerned down to the lowest boy that may carry out a paper, they were liable to be interrupted by one of the foremen or head compositors, pushed on, it may be, by an agent in some distant part, breaking out into a declaration that it was necessary to stop work and directly go to fight with the men of an establishment on the opposite side of the way, and for the reason, that disputes were going on in a printing-office at John O'Groat's House, which nothing but immediate hostilities with the printers opposite could prevent from turning into a war.

Without stopping to comment on the absurdity of the plea advanced, what would be the means by which the attempt would be put down? Clearly by the consciousness of general interest. There might be here and there a lad, who thought a fight would be an enlivening thing, and enjoyed the notion of seeing the type all scattered about the stairs, and himself employed in tying handfuls of it in canvas bags, to be used for pelting the opponents' pressmen. But even he, by the time he had slept on it, might probably have raised a doubt, whether all this would not end in great scarcity of porridge, and rueful looks among the society at home, when he brought nothing but a bloody nose to assist at Sunday's dinner. And all of riper age, would come to the like conclusion still more surely, and see extended reasons why this great foolery should not be allowed to go on.

There is, then, an admitted course which is for the common good, and an admitted course which is not. There may be disputes after all, whether the workmen, severally or generally, have the exact share that should come to them, or whether the proprietor has reasonable cause of complaint against them, that they make too many holidays and too little work. But this does not affect the grand truth, which is, that everybody is interested in the success of the *True Scotsman;* that all are concerned in seeing the affairs of the firm conducted in a peaceful, regular, and orderly manner, and whatever may be the delights of an occasional outbreak to freshen the blood, it is from the success of the quiet and harmless industry, and not from street rows and quarrels however eminently successful, that the great blessings of the bakehouse and the kail-pot are to be looked for by sensible people.

Just so it is in the conduct of national affairs. There will always be working men desiring to have more than they get, and masters desiring to pay less than they do; and between these there may always be a sort of contest going on, and it is very likely that no way will ever be hit upon, for reducing the

matter to a settled rule which shall equally satisfy all parties. But this is no excuse for anybody's overlooking the truth, that there are great and common interests in seeing the general concern go on with as much of success as it is possible to give it. The working men may be always interested in receiving a shilling more, and the master in paying a shilling less, and yet this not at all affect the fact, that the prosperity of the concern at large is what all must stand by, and that this is the thing which will settle all disputes, by making the master as glad to pay higher wages, as he now is to pay smaller. If any man says, the master is a keen hand, and will never pay the higher wages if the smaller ones will do; answer, that it is just because the smaller will not do, that he will pay the higher. An improved trade brings better profits and more of them to the master; and the first thing this puts him upon, is bidding for more and better hands, for the sake of what he shall get by it; and so he serves out one portion of his increased profits in increased wages, to secure the other.

The truth is, that all this is much more curiously arranged without man's interference, than is known by those who have not given their attention particularly to the subject. As none knows better than the anatomist, that the animal body is fearfully and wonderfully made, so in the body commercial there are contrivances and compensations, which keep the system going, without any thanks to man, who would hinder it if he could. The inquiry into what can be done and what cannot, forms in these days one of the most useful sciences to which learned or unlearned can address themselves. To know what can be mended, and apply to it,—and what cannot be mended, and let it alone,—forms a sort of political medicine,—which there is no need to keep in the hands of either quacks or colleges.

In the present letter I have tried to show, that there is no inherent defect in the constitution of things as regards commercial union; but that on the contrary, if we can find it out, there *is* a regimen or rule recommended by nature, in which the interests of all combine. And in my next I will try to show the same of what may be termed the political.

London, 26 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Bolton Free Press.

No. VI.

AMERICANS NOT INFALLIBLE ON THE FREE-TRADE QUESTION.—ALL PROTECTIVE DUTIES A NATIONAL LOSS.

SIR,—Knowing the interest your readers feel in commercial questions, I proceed to trouble them with some extracts from an "Appeal to the Democratic Electors of the County of Lewis," in a New York paper of the 29th of September last. Perhaps they will come to the conclusion, that there is nothing in the air of America that makes men so sharp, as to necessitate an agreement at Bolton with their commercial maxims.

The "Appeal" is an attempt to rally that portion of the electors who stand on the principle of keeping out foreign produce, in order to benefit America by raising the same at home at greater expense.

The exordium is magniloquent, and possesses the advantage of assuming the matter in dispute.—

'Ever since the organization of the Government of these United States, there have been two political divisions or parties, having distinctive characteristics: the one, seeking the happiness of the whole by endeavouring to protect the various branches of the [industry of the] country, contending that our prosperity consists in establishing and preserving our independence and freedom, by ceasing to rely upon foreign countries for the necessaries and comforts of life, and sustaining the interests of the whole body politic, not from the aggressions of a foreign invader in time of war, but carefully nourishing and cherishing the institutions of our country for the common benefit of all in time of peace; while on the other side are arrayed those, who have ever been and are now, endeavouring to retain power and influence and secure their own personal aggrandizement, regardless of the interests and happiness of the country.'

Very convincing of course, this. The object being to aid in persuading the Americans at large, that they ought not to trade with the people of Bolton for such things as could be furnished cheaper there, and that wisdom requires they should be kept out by a Tarif.

Follow references to sundry authorities for this effort of economical science.

The first is, to resolutions passed by Washington, Jefferson, and other leading Americans in 1774, against importing

British goods or manufactures. This ought to have been omitted, because it was a war measure directed against Great Britain, and consequently no model for what should be the conduct of a nation where war is only a possible contingency. When Mathews's Frenchman quarrels with a turnpike-man, he is represented as saying "I will not go through your *pike!*" But there would be no wit in making him refuse to go through all turnpikes, where the quarrelling was only a contingency.

In 1780 Washington is found saying—

'Congress have repeatedly, and not without success, directed their attention to the encouragement of manufactures. The object is of too much consequence not to insure a continuance of their efforts, in every way that shall appear eligible. Ought our country to remain dependent on foreign supply, precarious, because liable to be interrupted? If the necessary article should, in this mode, cost more in time of peace, will not the security and independence thence arising, form an ample compensation?'

It is as certain that Washington said this, as that he was unacquainted with the application of steam to boats and railways. But it is as likely that if he had lived now, he would have been better informed on one subject as on the other.

In July 1789 Madison is found advocating an Act declaring it to be necessary, for "the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares and merchandise imported."

In 1802 Jefferson is found saying—

'To cultivate peace and maintain commerce and navigation in all their lawful enterprises, and to protect the manufactures adapted to our circumstances, are the landmarks by which to guide ourselves in all our proceedings.'

And again in a letter in 1816 he is found saying—

'We have experienced, what we did not before believe, that there exists both profligacy and power enough to exclude us from the field of interchange with other nations; that, to be independent for the comforts of life, we must fabricate them ourselves. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist. The grand inquiry now is, shall we make our own comforts, or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He therefore, who is against our domestic manufactures, must be for reducing us, either to a dependence on that nation, or to be clothed in skins, and live like wild beasts, in dens and caverns. I am proud to say I am not one of these.'

A little nonsense can be uttered under the illusion of patriotism, in America as here. Who wanted to be clothed in skins? If the fact was that war with England had put a stop

to the introduction of English manufactures, nobody wanted to do otherwise than as recommended, manufacture for themselves as fast as they could find the way. But the question really at issue was, whether it was wise that America in all future time should go on refusing English manufactures. It was this, and not whether she should be clothed in skins.

Monroe and Harrison are further cited as holding the same opinions; and Clay in 1824 is represented as "calling on the nation to protect itself *by restrictions on foreign trade*, in order to diminish the foreign debt, increase domestic manufactures, and protect home industry." It cannot be held certain from what is given, whether these expressions are all literally those of the authority to whom they are ascribed, or are transfused through the views and wishes of the writer. The phrase in italics is one which has not been often ventured on by the holders of that side of the argument; and the language of the other parts makes a suspicious approximation to what has been made familiar at later periods.

These are given as the views of "our enlightened republicans upon the interests of *every department of industry of our country*." The last words are a curious interpolation upon the republican statesmen. For it is plain that they all, with scarcely a discoverable exception, contemplated "restrictions on foreign trade" as a sort of military weapon, expensive and perhaps dangerous in the use, but necessary; and not as promoting "the interests of every department of industry." It was left for their successors to make the grand discovery, of what has since been paraded under the title of "protection to native industry" as an abstract source of gain.

It can scarcely be necessary to remark to zealous and intelligent traders like yours of Bolton, that when the Americans determined to manufacture certain goods for *three* shillings instead of buying them with *two* shillings or two shillings' worth of American goods at Bolton, the aggregate of American citizens lost or threw away the *one*. For if the American consumer under the state of violence laid out three shillings for the goods, thereby giving employment, profits, and wages to American citizens to that amount,—it is equally certain that in a state of nature he would have laid out two shillings on some American citizens for the goods that were to answer the bills given in payment at Bolton, and the other shilling on some others, for some kind of produce else, unless it can be proved that he would throw it into the sea. On American commerce the effect then in the aggregate is just the same; but there is one remarkable difference between the cases,

which is that in one the American consumer gets something for his third shilling, and in the other nothing. America then in the aggregate is mulcted to the amount of those third shillings, in other words of the difference of price. And this is nothing but what would happen if Americans could be persuaded to any other mode of giving more money for less goods; as for instance, if they could be led by their authorities into hiring a man to cut wood with a blunt hatchet, for the sake of paying him three days' wages instead of two for the same wood cut.

The republican statesmen then are not chargeable with the folly of recommending restrictions on foreign trade as the means of increasing national wealth. They viewed them as an expensive, which is the same as saying a wealth-consuming, process for resisting foreign aggression. And on this ground only are they justly to be put on their defence.

On this, the first remark that will occur is that England now is not in the same circumstances as America in her nonage. Supposing it granted, that it was politic for young America to think two legs dangerous for fear they should be cut off, it does not follow that England must submit to the same precautionary deprivation. It has been established that England, even during the most extended war, has always been able to carry on her foreign trade. She boasts that her navy does this for her, and that her trade in turn supports her navy. But it appears that we are to brag of the navy and pay for it, but to have no good of it. England suffers under "restrictions on foreign trade" equally with America, only with a change in the name of the matter to be restrained. The manufacturer of Bolton is "under restrictions" like the agriculturist in America, and for the same alleged reason, that if he was allowed to trade, his trade might be cut off.

As there is nothing more effectual than viewing our own deformities in the glass of others, you will perhaps think these observations not altogether without their use.

London, 5 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXXIII.

How we may take advantage of the present crisis.

Sir,—Allow me to impress upon your readers the importance of taking advantage of the discoveries which the last few

weeks have brought to light, to place the cause of progress, civilization, and humanity, on a sounder and consequently a firmer basis than it has ever been before. The desertion of the Whig government to the Holy Alliance, has acted as a time of persecution was wont to do upon the church, and shown us who were the rootless plants, that in the hour of trial fall away. There has been woeful disappointment among the friends of peace and liberty. Nothing but the faith that comes by sight, could have convinced them of the possibility of a ministry going over so openly and revoltingly to the common enemy. But less still could they have expected to see, as they have, rampant Radicals raging for war in the ranks of Russia, and men professing liberal ideas flaming for the execution of Holy Alliance decrees of blood.

They went out from us because they were not of us. Every man has a right to change sides; but not to change sides and wear his old uniform to discredit it. Advantage must be taken of this, to make a test for future use. Weakness and ignorance may be forgiven; but no man who has raised his voice for war, should ever be considered as other than an enemy disguised. A War Reformer and a Peace Reformer are two totally hostile animals; there can be no combination between them after they are known to each other.

And here, it is not our interest to confound the protest, with what some amiable and well-meaning sects have made against war in general; though we are not bound to oppose their going along with us in the present case. Show us a war we believe necessary and just, and we are as ready for war as anybody. Propose to us, for instance, to take the opposite side in the contest actually begun. Let the government ask us to subscribe with purse or person, to help to drive the Holy Alliance from the Mediterranean, and defend the right of nations to settle their internal quarrels without the interference of foreign despots,—and there shall be no backwardness for the war. Still more, let it require our aid to assist France in repelling the assaults of the barbarian powers, and propose to us another bivouac in Belgium, to secure the left flank of free France while she recovers the *tête de pont* her enemies have established against her in the Rhenish provinces; and the God of battles shall once more stand among the objects of our worship. But it is because the war is not just, not necessary, and consequently not honourable; it is because it is unjust, unnecessary, and dishonourable both in the principle and in the mode of carrying it on; it is because we personally shrink from any contact with it, and from the idea of any connected with us

being brought into contact with it either; it is because it is a war in which all our wishes, hopes, and interests, are on the other side, a war which we consider as against ourselves and against our children, an outbreak of home enemies, who differ from invaders by the unfortunate circumstance that they are here to begin with and no sea to pass; it is for these causes, that we reject as having displayed the cloven foot of traitors or the shibboleth of fools, all who either side with the war which is intended to crush us, or adopt the half-way course of advising not to oppose.

If there are really any number of well-intentioned men, who holding a modest opinion of what would be the result of their opposition, lapsed into the lazier theory that possibly one course may in the end turn out as well as another; it must be permitted to remark, that because man cannot prophesy, he is bound to chuse the likeliest as the best. The sleeper of Wandsford was floated away on his haystack, and escaped the flood by which others perhaps were drowned, without his dreams having been disturbed. But nobody in those parts has since thought of having recourse to such a method. The question is still, as ever, whether to go to sleep as he did, is the likeliest way to escape a flood. So here, is letting the war go on, and allowing ourselves to be ranked among the people who did not oppose it, anything but the same kind of way of preserving ourselves from the flood that is coming? The man that should chuse the haystack, might say, "If I sleep quite sound, and consequently keep quite still, and if my haystack goes clear of all the arches of the bridge, and strikes against nothing else, and if it does not go to pieces of itself, and I do not slip off, and a boat meets me at the right time, and the people see me and pick me up,—who will be a better preserved man than I?" It may be true; but suppose all these *ifs* do not come to pass. If the government should begin a war, and be beaten by sea and land, and foreign Chartists invade England, and carry everything before them, and have nothing to do but set up the Charter when they have done, and no difference of opinion arises between one set of Chartists and another, and everybody agrees that they shall set up the Charter and go back again;—if all these combinations should occur, the Charter may have passed the bridge upon its haystack and be safe. But how if some one or other of the combinations fails. The Charter would then be obliged to swim for its life, with all the disadvantages the actual circumstances might give. It would find itself engulphed and buried, as during the wars within our knowledge all liberal

notions were; till the return of peace at some remote and uncertain time, made room for the struggle for popular rights to re-commence.

Instead of such sluggard's counsels, the way for ardent and energetic men would be, to do their best to hinder the war; always looking forward to what they will do if they *do not hinder it.* Is there any possible thing to be done *then*, that will be done the worse? Do not you see, that you will have ascertained these great points;—That your enemies were *obliged* to go to war, to stop the extension of popular rights; and that they *had rather* go to war, than allow such extension to go on? You will say perhaps, there is no novelty in that. There is all the novelty, which makes the difference between a thing being only suspected and surmised, and being declared by the act of the party. It is the difference between light life and conversation, and paying five shillings a-week to the parish. That the Whigs have been suspected long, is true; but their war is the bantling which brings all suspicions to an end, and starts them henceforward with a new character in history.

London, 5 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leicestershire Mercury.

No. III.

THE SYRIAN WAR.—FACTS WITHDRAWN OR NOT ATTENDED TO.

SIR,—As the letter on the causes of the intended war, in your paper of the 17th of October, appears to have attracted attention beyond provincial limits, I am induced to apply again to the subject which has been found so interesting before.

It was lately my chance to be in a moderately large company where the question was discussed; which gave me an opportunity of hearing something of the arguments by which the opposite side to ours is defended.

The first argument advanced, I recollect was, that there was no information before the public, on which a judgment of the impropriety of going to war could be founded. As if, before the possibility of a sensible nation allowing its managers to go to war could be entertained, there should not be strong evidence *for*, and not an absence (even if such were the case) of evidence *against*.

Was any man ever heard to say, "The government is issuing an order to stop my trade, burn my factories, or bring them to

a point where I may as well burn them myself, take my life or that of one or two of my children; but there is no evidence for me to form a judgment whether this is right or not. I should be sorry to oppose the government improperly. I shall therefore wait, and recommend my neighbours to do the same. It would be a most unhappy proceeding, if we were to stop the government, and find all this ought to have been done to us after all."

But if no man ever said the like, then the inference is that the propounders of this argument have no conviction that war is in itself an evil. They do not advance, that they have weighed the occasion and circumstances, and come to the conclusion that the war ought not to be stopped; but they say they have weighed nothing and they had nothing to weigh, and because they are without information why the war should go on, they conclude to do nothing to endanger its being stopped. Men do not reason in this manner, on a house on fire.

But in aid of this new kind of non-interference, I could not help observing a huge inattention to facts within reach. And the circumstances which there appeared a tendency to overshadow or withdraw, were principally these.

First, there was a total sinking of the point, that the terms "integrity of the Turkish Empire," in the understanding of reasonable men, always meant the protection of the Turkish Empire from invasion by a foreign power; never its preservation from the consequences of internal struggles. The English government had given its marked adhesion to this meaning, when it supported the Greeks in their dismemberment of the empire, at the expense of the integrity of that further portion of the Turkish power which might be resident in its fleet. No one ever heard of the new meaning of the terms, till the new Holy Alliance threw a light upon men's minds.

Secondly, no notice was taken of the fact, that the Sultan and the Pasha would long ago have settled their differences by negotiation, if the Holy Allies, with our Whigs at their head, had not declared they would not allow it.

Thirdly, no notice was taken of the fact, that the demand made by the Holy Allies upon the Pasha of Egypt, is not that he shall refrain from marching upon Constantinople; for that, it seems conceded in all quarters, would have formed a justifiable *casus belli*, as the phrase now is. It is that he shall abandon a territory secured to him by former convention, to which France and England were parties, and which, if the

sentiment of national honour existed in England, England would support as France does. It is true the treachery of England is defended on the pretence that Syria holds out advantages for marching to Constantinople. But this is like selling a man a horse, and then keeping it on the ground that it would enable him to go too fast. And all the results that can be had from the breach of faith, might have been obtained by an agreement to prevent the Pasha's march, and have left England in possession of her veracity. . .

Fourthly, there was complete oblivion of the circumstance, that the resistance of France is founded on the substantial ground of being a party to a contract in company with England, which contract the English ministers have broken, to the serious injury of the interest which France, while she trusted to British faith, considered as secured. And if it is asked what that serious interest is, it is the interest which the French, as a free people, have in defending the right of internal alteration without the interference of foreign armies, to which right the English are at this moment disgracefully opposed.

Amidst all this, it was remarkable that expressions of attachment to the liberal cause were profusely made by my company, and even acquiescence avowed in the wish I declared, that any war might be followed by such a coalition between the French and English peoples, as would probably be the last thing in the wishes of the governments on either side. Was not this like desiring that two ships may be brought to action by their officers, for the chance of the merry meeting between the crews after both have done their worst?

Since writing the above, I have seen the "Answer" to my first letter, signed "A Radical Elector of the Borough of Leicester," which is in your paper of the 31st of October. The answer is of a kind which I should be extremely anxious to circulate with the letter which produced it, as showing what the other side has to stand upon; and I am not aware of any important point in which I could have altered the present letter, if it had been intended for a reply.

The Pasha of Egypt, instead of endangering the East-Indian possessions of Great Britain, has done, and is doing yet, in spite of British treachery and bomb-shells, more than all the powers of the earth together will ever do, to secure the union of the two divisions of the British empire. And the Radical who is to encourage ministers to rush into a war every time they can discover a "brave people" who will be induced by the gift of arms to use them against their existing government,

will have very little time left for anything but patting his ministers on the back. Seriously, let me remonstrate with all men calling themselves "Radicals," on the extreme folly of some of them supporting, and others viewing with indifference, a movement which is so manifestly intended to close political agitation for Reform, by the same manœuvre which was so successful in 1792. My memory of that time is not sufficient to tell, whether there were Reformers in those days huzzaing the ministers to war, in aid of the "brave people" of La Vendée.

London, 2 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Manchester Advertiser.

No. V.

RESEMBLANCE BETWEEN THE PRESENT TIME AND 1792.—ABSURDITY OF REFUSING TO "HEAR ABOUT FOREIGN POLITICS."

SIR,—As I have no desire to gain popularity by encouraging the weaknesses of our friends, I take the opportunity to remonstrate with the Chartists, or such as are open to it, on the extreme imprudence of displaying indifference on the Whiggish plan for involving us in war. As for those who pat ministers on the back and call themselves "Radicals," I trust we are all too far advanced in years and knowledge, to bite at such a hook. But what I want to protest against now, is the treating the affair with apathy, and whether we can finally hinder it or not, losing the chance of enrolling our names among those who were not taken in.

It is precisely the plan of 1792 over again. At that time, the spirit of reform had become strong enough to be very troublesome. It had had some successes, particularly in Ireland; and England was anxious to do something in her turn. All of which may be considered as bearing some analogy to the partial success obtained in the Reform Bill. But having tasted a little, the people wanted more. This is the state of things now. The government saw, that it must fill the mouths or stop them. It had been a sort of see-saw reforming government like the present; and like this, it chose the last. The earliest opportunity for war was seized; and, as now, the outcry was against the violence and rashness of the people of France. Of the professed reformers among English public men, some split and took kindly to the war; others went on, keeping up an honourable but very unavailing resistance. And what subse-

quently came of it, it is scarcely needful to recapitulate. Headings and transportations, sometimes suffered and sometimes narrowly missed, were the portion of the active reformers in the popular class. The day on which this is dated, is the anniversary of one great event of that nature, when the escape of Hardy, Thelwall, and Horne Tooke, through the courage of their defender and the honesty of a jury, stopped the proscription, by which it is now known the land was to have been covered with the blood of reformers, if the engine had not broken down. In twelve months' time, the same fruits will be in season, if the same seed is sown. You are not very well off now, sitting upon benches on the silent system, or shrinking from the cold which you are officially told is 'part of your punishment;" with the rest of the bodily tortures inflicted by a power which the crown, through its ministers, avows itself unable to control. But will your condition be mended, when such partial checks as may be existing now, shall have been removed and swallowed up by the breaking out and congregating of all the bad passions attendant upon war? If a man wanted to afflict you, what could he do better, than cause you to be run down as public traitors, when you now are only hunted as erring politicians?

Suppose reformers of the olden time had been asked, after the horrible events that followed 1792 in England and in Ireland, "Why did not you oppose? Why did not you at least raise your voices? How came you to see so palpable a net drawn round you, and not at all events leave evidence you were not deceived?" And imagine the reformers to reply, "We did not know that war with France would hurt us. We wanted reform, and thought that we should get it by refusing to take part with those who opposed the war. They were not all so zealous nor so quick as we wanted them to be, in helping us to such parts of reform as we had set our hearts upon; and so we said, let us hear nothing about foreign politics, we want reform. And here we are, wanting reform still, and with foreign politics that have driven us back from five-and-twenty years' advances." This must have been their language, if such simple men existed then.

I observe a Chartist of the present day says at some public meeting, "We want to hear nothing about foreign politics." Slaves want to hear nothing about foreign politics; or when they do, they take side with their masters. When the Count de Grasse was in the West Indies with a fleet, the negroes were all furious against "that *Cut-Grass* rascal." Their masters had instilled into them, that the Count was coming

to make them cut two bundles of grass instead of one. But this was reasonable, compared with the man who, wanting freedom here, declares against hearing about foreign politics. For nobody has told him to resist that he may escape two bundles instead of one; on the contrary, everybody knows it is the way to get it.

Put the case that the foreign politics consisted in making an agreement with Russia or the other despotic powers, to send a force to put down the Chartists and keep them down. The thing is not so wonderful; I have seen Russian troops in Hull. They were not brought to fight the people of Hull; they were to fight the people of Holland within hearing, and so make room for somebody else to handle the people of Hull if need were. If the foreign politics, then, were to bring the Russians, would our Chartist friend say, "We want to hear nothing about foreign politics"? And if the foreign politics are not exactly for this just now, what are they for that is a great deal better?

They are to renew and get up again the lively exchange of interest with despotic powers. They are to lead off our imaginations from getting good laws at home, and fix them upon how a brave man, resisting the invasion of his country abroad, shrieks when his skull is cloven to the brain by an Englishman's sword, and how a commander, fighting with musquets against eighty-four pounders, can be slaughtered by the fire of two marines at once. We are to be brutalized on all sides, and so made meet partners for the company we keep. All the war interests are to be collected and made cock-a-hoop, in order that all peace interests may be trodden down and quail. Your affections are to be fixed, not on who makes most reform, but who puts most down. You are to be the baggage-cattle of that portion of the Quadruple Alliance which consists of Whig; and this you propose not to resist, because you want to hear nothing about foreign politics. If the foreign politics were the invention of your friends, you might decline to trouble yourselves. But they are the invention of your enemies; is not that enough to put you on your guard?

I rejoice to find our friend Vincent is seeing light on this subject through his prison bars. He says, "What care the "working-men of England, or the middle-classes either, about "'settling the affairs of Turkey and Egypt,' when our own "'affairs' want 'settling' at home? Why all this foreign "hubbub? Are the aristocracy really afraid of the democra-"tic spirit of the people—and do they hope to divert that "spirit by a foreign war?" To be sure they do; there is

small doubt of that. But there wanted a little more. The hare "cares nothing" about being hunted with the greyhounds, in the sense in which the working-men care nothing about the foreign war. But she cares a great deal about preventing it if she knew how; and so ought they.

The upshot is, to beg of the Chartists not to make dunces of themselves, as some of them have done before. The men who put themselves forward to stop this Whig war, may not all be of your best friends for the whole voyage. They may even have scorned and despitefully used you. Perhaps they have done the same to me. But it is no excuse for not fighting the people's battle as it ought to be fought, and where it can be fought, that some of those who would have fought it with you were not men you particularly liked for any recollections you had of them before.

London, 5 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Nottingham Review.

No. III.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND MOVING BACK TO THE GROUND OCCUPIED BY THE CHURCH OF ROME.—"NEW PROTESTANTISM" WANTED.

SIR,—The struggle for religious liberty is taking an exasperated form, in consequence of the movement in advance lately made on the part of what is denominated the Established Church; one consequence of which must be expected to be, the bringing over to the party of resistance a number of what were formerly quiescent spectators of the contest.

Nothing could apparently be less politic or well-advised, in the actual position of opinions and of parties, than for a Church professing to live by virtue of being "that pure and reformed part of God's Holy Catholic Church to which we belong," to break into reprobation of the Reformation effected by our forefathers, and formally march back, with trumpet and with shawm, to re-occupy the ground from which her predecessor the Church of Rome was driven. But the question of prudence must be settled by the result.

It may be true, that *all* the Church called of England has not ostensibly engaged in this, nor have the heads given all the recognition and assistance of which the case may finally be capable. But the adventuring detachment has been allowed to move out unchecked, and according to its success will be

the conduct of the force behind. A sort of Texas invasion has been made on what were considered the defenceless provinces of religious liberty; and the mass is waiting to acknowledge and support, when the proper time arrives.

The propositions advanced by the new English Catholics in possession of tithes and church-rates, appear to be these. That the Protestant Reformation was a mistake and a blunder. That instead of denying the divine right claimed by the Church of Rome, and demanding the exercise of private judgment in the examination of the scriptures, the Reformers should have limited themselves to asserting, that there was an error in believing the true church to be at Rome, the fact being that she was somewhere else. But that with this exception, the claims of the Church of Rome in the main were just and true. That it is certain, and to be received by all Christians, that government and the power of making laws are held only by authority from God, administered through the channel of the true church; the same having been so notably exemplified in the cases of Christ and his apostles, and handed down to the present times by a chain of unbroken admission and practice. That by a like exercise of judgment, it will be evident that the Church of England, in its dignities and constitution, is by direct procession from Christ and his apostles; Judas Iscariot having held the first bishopric, and bishops and priests having been so plentiful in the time of Timothy, that every elder was a priest and every priest was a bishop. That education can only be lawfully conducted by the true church; and they who conduct it otherwise, shall receive to themselves damnation. That confession and the use of images are good things lost, through the precipitancy of the pretended reformers of the Church; and to be returned to as shall be convenient. That commerce and manufactures are dangerous to ecclesiastical discipline; and the Church's lay government shall put them down, and parcel out the population into rural colonies under the supervision of a land-lord and a soul-lord.

If anybody thinks this an exaggerated representation, let him take the trouble to compare it with the acknowledged documents in the hands of the public.

In addition to this the new Church sneers at the word "dissent," as not to be found in the scriptures. The allegation is true; and the word perhaps is feeble. The time appears to be come, when it would be well to replace it by the stouter term "protest." We "dissent" from that to which we feel no actual or lively hostility; but we "protest" against what we view as the invasion of an enemy.

What right had our fathers to protest, that has not been given to ourselves?

And how far are we from the "doctrine that the *Church* can depose kings," and the rest of what were "damnable" when Rome stood in the place of Canterbury? If the right of civil government comes only through the Church, then every man is bound by his soul's health to depose the king the Church may disapprove. There seems no disputing the consequence, if the premises are to be allowed.

Query, is it not time for a sect of "New Protestants" to be setting themselves in array against the "New Catholics" that are coming over us?

London; 4 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editors of the Sheffield Iris.

No. IV.

QUADRUPLE ALLIANCE.—SNUFF-BOX FLATTERY.

SIRS,—As I do not like to put in my oar while a war on the big and little loaf is in progress at Sheffield, I am in some sort driven back upon the subject whose interest is concentrated on the present moment to a greater extent than even that of the Corn Laws.

The arguments which will be presented against putting out the fire which the ministers for their own purposes have lighted up, will be found when the assembly of all-talkers and no-doers meets again, to be principally two. The mischief has been attempted, in reliance on these arguments to put down remedy; and therefore it is but just and right to be prepared with the replies.

The first will be, that the country is *committed*, and therefore it is in honour bound to go on.

The answer to this is, that this is precisely the principle which takes a felon to the gallows and leaves him there. He finds himself *committed* to a simple theft. The necessity arises for either adding murder, or what a government newspaper would call "succumbing." But rascals must never "succumb;" if they do, there is an end of their trade. So they move on to the gallows where they are waited for. Such an argument might do, therefore, for the felons in politics, but not for the honest men. There will be no use in pleading to *them*, "You have been led into something desperately wicked,

disgraceful, and mean; and the only way you can get over it, is either to give up us who led you into it, or support it by something *more* wicked, *more* disgraceful, and *more* revolting to the feelings of sensible and respectable people." The hope probably will lie, in making the honest men mistake their own honour and credit, for the honour and credit of those who have led them into the pretended difficulty. Whereas there is in reality no difficulty at all in saying, "We put these men in trust, and acting in our name they have proceeded to disgraces which we are ashamed of. We should be sorry to admit for a moment that their credit is ours. It is because it is not, that we wish them brought to open shame, protesting and avowing that the deed was not ours and shall not be. We are in the situation of the bankers whose clerk has committed a fraud in their name. We beg you of all things to believe, that it was he and not we, and that the sooner he is given up to the consequences, the better we shall be pleased."

If the public were penetrated with this reply in all directions, it would wonderfully check the glee with which a dapper minister will advance the reason in the House of Commons, and look to the benches of the "good reformers" for silence, while the Tories will applaud.

The second plea will be, that *obligations must be kept.*

O, that is a weighty truth,—that obligations must be kept! where is the naughty man, that would not keep obligations? But suppose a government has made an obligation, and then broken it and made a contrary;—which is it bound to keep—the first obligation or the last? O, it is a weighty duty, that of keeping obligations! Think of a minister in the House of Commons being put on his defence, for keeping obligations! —the only objection in the case being, that they were of the *second class* of obligations, and not the *first.* A minister makes obligations, and breaks them and makes others directly hostile to those who were parties to the first; and then he produces himself with the graces peculiar to injured virtue, and "hopes the time shall never arrive, when the proud country he represents shall allow of any tampering with sacred obligations!" The truth is, that the "proud country" has been trodden into all the mire of broken obligations already; and has no chance of purgation, but by giving up the men who did it, and saying "We are not the knaves to support." The credit of English veracity is already in the dirt. A convention was made by the English ministers in conjunction with our honourable and high-spirited neighbours the French; and speedily afterwards the French discover, that without in-

forming them, the English ministry, bribed by what flattery, promises, or snuff-boxes of the Holy Barbarians time may show, has made an agreement to gratify the Holy Allies with the assistance of an English fleet, to accomplish the direct contrary of that to which the English faith and honour were engaged.

There has been no treason like it since Iscariot's. None where such a web of public and private sympathies, encouraged, cherished, and avowed at board and temple, have been so rashly and unexpectedly broken through. They omitted nothing but the kiss. They certainly have not of late been fraternizing with the people. What were the "thirty pieces," for something they must have been? What could it be, that Belial set in the ministerial eye, to effect the Quadruple Alliance of Russia, Austria, Prussia, and that Fourth which *might* have gone down to posterity as the name of politicians who on the whole had done their country service?

London, 29 *Oct.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Suffolk Chronicle.

No. IV.

WAR AGAINST THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION, BY THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

SIR,—If there is a probability of war abroad, there is no difficulty in finding out a war at home to match. One is to play into the hands of the other. The war abroad is to distract attention from the war at home; and the success of the war at home, is to make us all good recruits for carrying on wars abroad.

The pointed movement our enemies have made against us at home, is in the bold advance which what is denominated the Established Church, has made towards the old ground occupied by the Church of Rome. The Romish doctrines in fact are upon us, with the exception that there is a difference in the latitude and longitude of the place whence they are to issue. The true volcano is proved to be not at Rome; we are to be pelted with the same missiles, and smothered with the same brimstone, only the crater is to be here.

There is neither jesting nor exaggeration in this. An effective portion of the Church called of England, has broken into open reprobation of the work, partial and stunted as it

was, which our fathers called the Reformation. It publicly assails the doers, as having fallen into the grievous error of pulling down the strong holds of the Papacy, instead of occupying them for themselves.

The claim of the Church to be superior to kings and civil governors, as being the only channel through which their authority can be derived;—the demand consequently of a veto upon all laws, and all education;—the superseding of the scriptures by endless appeals to tradition and authority, being in fact the tradition and authority of its own corporation;—and the assumption of a divine, unbroken right derived from Christ and his apostles, on the foundation of pretended similarities in ceremonies and discipline, which examined consist only in the abuse of words;—these are the steps by which the advanced guard of modern Churchmen is proceeding to take its stand upon "the ancient ways."

Meantime the more inert masses of the Church look on; waiting, as is always the case in revolutions, to see how the bolder will succeed. It is a sort of Texas invasion of religious freedom; the active attack, and the rest wait behind to acknowledge and support. No remonstrance, no disapprobation, has proceeded from any ecclesiastical authority. Canterbury is as willing to be Rome if anybody will make her, as she would be unwilling to return to the condition of the Master who had not where to lay his head.

Under these circumstances it is plain, that boldness must be met by boldness. The organs of the Church taunt their opponents with there being no such word in the scriptures as "dissent." It must be changed into "protest." If the ancient tyranny is up again and doing, the ancient cry of liberty must meet it on the wind. All persecutions with which men have in these latter days been persecuted, will be light and tolerable compared with what shall come upon us if not opposed. John Thorogood may have been a year in prison; but if all law had been of the Church, John Thorogood would have been a year ago manuring the roots of the only true vine, with the ashes of a heretic.

The political and social condition of men can as little stand still, as a needle stand upon its point. It must be moving one way, or it will move the other. As concerns religious and civil liberty, the movement at this moment is frightfully retrograde. The overbearing sect sees its time, and advances accordingly; while the pleasures of blood and the disgraces of glory are to distract attention from the defence. This is what has come of time-serving and half-measures in all direc-

tions. As in politics, so on the question of religious freedom, the watchers did their best to show that they only wanted pushing to make them yield. The dogs of the flock showed no teeth, except for their dinners; and the wolves were speedily encouraged to make breach upon the fold. Even now, their great anxiety will be to find people who will not do too much; and astonishing is the success with which that desire is generally crowned.

It is no time for Erastian to be struggling with Semi-Erastian, when the great Claverhouse of all is seen in motion to attack. There are many valuable things which all men may preserve, though all men cannot set up their own particular choice in the seat of supremacy. It is in this situation that moderate and prudent men find themselves at present. Those who have been asleep in time past, have in one sense done well; for there are sleepless times apparently before them. When the Establishment is in full march for Rome, how long may it be before the Dissenters resume their old Cameronian positions in the hills?

London, 9 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the True Scotsman.

No. III.

UNION OF MEN'S POLITICAL INTERESTS, IF THEY COULD ONLY FIND IT OUT.—WHAT DO THE MIDDLE CLASSES WANT?—HOW PARTIES RISE TO INFLUENCE.

SIR,—I was to try to show, that in like manner as there is, when well understood, a union of commercial interests among classes which are apt to consider themselves as naturally opposed, so a union exists also to a great extent in their political, if they can only find it out.

What all men desire, is power to take care of themselves. But some men go a reasonable way to get it, and some not. Some ask themselves the naked question, of what they would like to have; and then proceed to try to take it, as a child before a jeweller's window stretches out its hand to what it thinks most brilliant. Others ask themselves not only what they would like, but what they are likely to get; and they speedily find out, that what any man gets in this world, depends principally on what he can make other men do either for him, or with him. There is little hazard in concluding, that these last are they that finally compass the most, of whatever their objects may be.

And what is true of individuals, is true from the action of the same causes, of collections or combinations of men, political or otherwise. To have much chance of success, they must ask themselves not only what they would like, but what others would like. There is scarcely an instance, of one party among many, getting a thing because it cried for it. Its only chance of success, is by working its way among all parties, making itself useful to this, and dangerous to that, as circumstances may direct.

A political party at its commencement,—which may be defined to be the time when, whether its component members are numerically much or little, it first produces itself as a card of some sort in the public game,—is generally considered as something extravagant and out of reason; and this very charge of extravagance, may put or keep it down to any conceivable extent. But by and by it begins to be found out, that the new doctrine, however extravagant it may be voted, does not hinder its holders from being useful on other subjects. Occasions arise, on which their assistance will gladly be accepted, and give them a claim to assistance again, on the chance of being once more wanted in their turn. In this way, many opinions which half a century ago were almost in abeyance, have climbed up to notice and to influence. While they slept in the heads of studious but inactive men, they were considered merely as dangerous abstractions; but when they got into the hands of stirring agents, who knew how to make themselves of importance to other men's interests and passions, they speedily took rank among the substantial facts of history. The Slavery-Abolitionists, the Catholic-Emancipationists, the Unitarians, are all existing instances of this species of progression.

In the same way, it would appear reasonable that the operative classes, who are so justly bestirring themselves for the amendment of their social and political condition, should expect to rise. The strength of a party, physical or moral, must be measured by its numbers, multiplied by the strength of each. But physical, in these days, means military: and though there are, or might be, cases which might create a popular party of great and overwhelming military force,—as was exemplified in the English Civil Wars,—there is little approximation to such a state of things now; and even then, the first lesson presented is, that there was an amazing sense of union among different classes engaged. There was no dispute in those days between the psalm-singing weaver, and the nobleman who kept a godly chaplain from Geneva in hi-

family. Physical strength, then, being set aside as foreign to the question, what is their political? And here the first fact is, that though the numbers of the operatives are great, the political strength of each and every of them has been made studiously and artificially small. With the exception of an inconsiderable number who were periodically fed and paid to keep up a pretence of popular election under the original rotten borough system, the political strength of each may be said at that time to have been null. The Reform Bill gave a little more; and not much. The bootless attempt at doing something by arms, has diminished the actual amount; and, on the whole, there can be no mistake in saying that the condition of the operatives, as a political party, is one that calls for the tactics of small forces which are to act upon great.

One of the first objects of a force so situated should evidently be, to make as many friends as it can, and no enemies that it can help. And for this purpose, it must not make mistakes as to whom it ought to be friends with; even though the parties in question should be lacking in reciprocal knowledge. Now the truth is, that the middle classes have either no interests, or much less than have been supposed, in opposition to the operatives. They may fancy they have; which for the time being may prevent combination. But if the fancy can be proved unfounded, there is an opening at least for future good.

What do the middle classes want? They want first to know what hurts them, and even the knowledge that they are hurt. It is quite a mistake to say a man is not hurt because he does not know it. If a coachman, for instance, has been driving all day with a leash of lubberly boys sitting behind, it is not the knowledge that constitutes the injury. The middle classes, or the honest portions of them, want to free themselves from the ways in which they are injured by the classes which ride behind, helped by the dishonest portion of their own. They want to have good government instead of bad; a government that shall act in their interest and not against it, and give them the fair enjoyment of the chances art and nature put before them. And do the operatives want anything except the extension of the same blessing to themselves? Or is there anything in the blessing, which makes it the better for being limited, or diminishes its security by increasing the number of concerned? It would be hard to show there can be.

What sensible objection then can the middle classes have to the enlargement of the political power and privileges of the

operatives? To take a large example. Before the question had been embittered as it has been needlessly of late, what possible result of Universal Suffrage or of any attainable progress towards it, could have been unfavourable to the middle classes? The Universal Suffragists would have been against the New Poor Law; but, till the question got exasperated, they would have done a much better thing than preserving the New Poor Law, for they would have helped to remove the Law that made the poor. But so it ever is. The honester classes cannot agree, and then step in the dishonest, who take the oyster and leave the shells.

But if the middle classes, whether they know it or not, have no substantial distinction of interest from the operatives, and consequently none in resisting the extension to them of political privileges, the operatives ought not to lose a chance, by treating them as if they were necessarily enemies. There is little doubt that of the two, the operatives are making the most rapid advances now, and as a whole, know most already on the subjects mainly concerned. The misconduct or ignorance of others ought, therefore, to be no guide for them. As is said to children when they quarrel, "You should have been the wisest."

There is nothing degrading or time-serving in what is here proposed. On the contrary, the exhortation is, that the operatives should carry an independent flag, and manœuvre it well. Let them join at an election to tell some one man that he was elected because they chose it, and if he does not please them shall not be elected again. And when they have any number, small or great, of such men in the legislature, let these wait for the time when they can decide a division and say, "This was because the operatives chose it." These are the ways by which other parties have risen to influence; and by these may they.

At all events, there seems something more promising in such a plan, than in sitting down to say, "We will help nobody and nobody shall help us, till what we want falls into our mouths." The boy who sits on a gate, in hopes of marrying a prince's daughter who shall go by, is not a much more unlikely candidate for success.

London, 4 Nov. 1840.

To the Editor of the Bolton Free Press.

No. VII.

WHAT IS THE USE OF PARLIAMENT?—HAVE WE A LIMITED GOVERNMENT?—MUST WE GO TO WAR WHEN THE ARISTOCRACY CHUSES?

SIR,—The Town Council of Bolton has taken honourable precedence in demonstrations of remonstrance, which are, I trust, only the beginning of the establishment of a real popular check on the waste of the country's resources and the destruction of its trade. The boast in England has always been, that the conduct of public affairs was not at the mercy of royal or aristocratic passions; that we had deliberation, that we had counsel; and above all, that money for royal or aristocratic amusements could not be extracted from us but by our consent.

Now, compare this with the lesson which is in the fact of being read to us. See how much deliberation, how much counsel, has been had upon the question, in which the interests of peace, commerce, and political reform, were all risked, whatever may be the final termination. Who deliberated? Who counselled? Were *you* asked? Were *your representatives* asked? Were anybody's representatives asked? Was not the whole affair got up in a corner, like a house-breaking? Does anybody deny, or doubt, or not know, that all explanations were shuffled off from the tail of the last meeting of parliament, in hopes of consummating the mischief before falling in with the head of the next? Is there to be an annual outbreak of this kind of government without parliament? And is the use of parliaments to be reduced to a spring meeting to pay the bills contracted while parliament was out of town?

We have all of us been, more or less, living in a fool's paradise. There is not one of us but had contracted notions of some imaginary safety and dignity we were existing in, which late circumstances have come most opportunely to disperse. For the question will hardly be raised, among men of ordinary intelligence and habits of the world, whether a safety which is not real, and a dignity resting on false grounds or none, are not delusions which it is a blessing to dispel.

We had an obscure notion, for instance, and some perhaps have it still, that we had a parliament, and that this could demand an account of the proceedings of the government, and

so bring them before the test of public judgment. In the first place, we have not a parliament, nor half a one; but something more curiously miscontrived than either, to wit a something sitting under the name one-half the year, and not the other. So that for any action in the way of watching which such an engine can produce, it is like a watchman who should proclaim himself off his post on alternate days, or weeks, or months, or half-years. And for any threat of retribution that is to take place at the hands of the absent watchman, upon those he shall discover to have been marauding in his absence, it is sufficient to ask whether an instance can be found in the world's circumference, of such a mode being adopted where the object really was to check.

We have been living then, in the notion that we had a checked and limited government when we had not. There might have been checks to a certain extent; for example, there might have been the check, that a prudent government would not have made the rash experiment upon the weakness of the popular security which has been hazarded. But the checks were none but what malevolence, or that bolder intruder folly, might break through when they chose. And as practice gives security, they will break through again as fast as occasions shall arise.

It will be most fortunate, whatever may have been the risk incurred, if the late demonstrations of the incompetence of what are deemed the popular securities for a wholesome check on the ministers of government, lead the middle classes, in whom the mass of influence is actually lodged, to reflect on the necessity of a movement for the further progress of political Reform, in combination with all other classes from whom aid can be derived. Any difference between their interests and those of such other classes, is only like the difference between the interests in good profits and in good wages. In one pitiful, half-sighted view of the question, there may be a difference. It is practicable to demonstrate, that as relates to the higgling between payer and receiver, all that is got from one is taken by the other. And there have not been wanting those, who have begged inquiry to stop here. But this is all straws and trumpery, compared to the greater fact, that the same general causes which bring good profits bring good wages, and the contrary. Our fathers had sense to know, that what is technically called "trade being good," was good for master and for man; and it is only our modern jealousies, aided either by great ignorance or some ill-will among those who set themselves up for teachers, which have ever brought the matter into doubt.

The insulting notice vouchsafed by the organ of the ministry, ought only to stimulate the intelligent remonstrants to persevere to a further end. There is no sense in sarcastically calling you "the wise men of the north," at all events till it is proved and established that fools did not live in the south. A commercial man at Bolton, accustomed to study the connexion between acts and their effects, by the token that he knew he must always pay for his own mistakes with his own money, is quite as likely to take a common-sense view of the necessity of a war in Syria, as a scion of aristocracy born to the expenditure of money he never earned, and whose only idea of war is that it is an agreeable thing in a gazette. By the demonstrations of commercial bodies in this same "north," the commercial and aristocratic influences have been fairly brought into collision; and it is not a few hard words or bad jokes which will settle the dispute. Every day must open the eyes of the commercial interests throughout the country, to the fact that the directing power is not where it ought to be, and that the pursuit of political Reform is the only way to shift the balance.

The question substantially is, whether we are to lead peaceful and honest lives when we might, or whether we are to be hounded out to do the foolish bloody work of silly individuals of the idle classes, every time they think there is money in the nation to the amount of half-a-crown a head, which it would be possible to get at by taxation. There is to be no accumulation, no husbanding of resources for a rainy day, no leaving in the pockets of those who worked for it and who own it; but one remorseless system of spending, in the recess of parliament, upon blood and national disgrace, all that can be got upon the speculation that the parliament that follows will pay the bill.

The Town Council of Bolton is further taunted, with being all too late. The man who finds his pocket-handkerchief has abandoned him, would in like manner be all too late, if there was no chance of anything like retributive proceedings afterwards. We have a practice of government arranged with an express view to honest men being always too late for stopping mischief; a cunningly-devised engine for the evil being done first and talked of afterwards. There is no use in taunting us with it; unless the intention was, that if any of us did not know it before, we should know it now. We know it, we always knew it; but not perhaps with that intimacy of conviction which has been so usefully enforced upon us.

London, 12 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXXIV.

CONSTANT SITTING OF PARLIAMENT.—FOLLY OF HAVING PARLIAMENT BY HALVES.

SIR,—The great lesson which it must be hoped the country will draw from the circumstances through which it has lately passed, is the necessity of having Six "Points" instead of "Five," and making the Sixth the "Constant Sitting of Parliament." Nothing can harmonize better with the others which were there before; but its closest connexion is with the "Shortening of Parliaments."

Lest this should be taken for a paradox or a contradiction, it will be well to call to mind the general object of both, and see how they play into each other's hands.

The object then is, that the people shall be represented. That is to say, that by the intervention of a council of manageable numbers elected by the people, the popular will shall be consulted in what is done or left undone by the government. That money shall not be spent, without the consent had of the people who are to pay; and that in fact no burdens fiscal or legislative, shall be imposed without hearing what can be advanced on the people's side, or on those of the various interests into which they may be split. Now this is a thing either good, or evil; either to be done effectually, or not at all. If it be an advantage that the people should preserve the power of the purse, let the means taken towards the purpose be effectual and not fictitious. If it be an evil, let it be given up at once, and no more troublesome and painful processes be gone through on pretence of compassing it. Or if there be any middle course, and it be good that the power of the purse should exist with the people up to a certain point, and that beyond this it should be somewhere else, let this too be avowed and proved, and there is nobody so unreasonable as not to accede to what shall be demonstrated.

But if there is to be any advantage to the people in the system of representatives, it must depend on the representation being real and actual, and not fictitious and imaginary. If there are benefits in having counsellors who are to be wiser than the people and the good of whom consists in their not thinking as the people think, nor feeling as the people feel, let these utilities be compassed by means of some kind of Second Chamber. But let us have a something somewhere, which shall give utterance to what David called the "mad-

ness of the people;" which shall at all events give voice, to what the people may have to say, why it should not suffer, and why it should not pay. Granted that it will all be abundantly foolish; but let its foolishness be heard. Let it have vent, if nothing else; let it not preserve the additional motive for grumbling, that it was doomed unlistened to.

But is the most likely way to secure this portion of the end in view, to take a man and say to him, "Be my representative, represent me; speak your own passions and let them be taken for my passions, and follow your own interests and let them be assumed to be my interests; be my *alter ego*, while I myself sit down and am nobody; and do all this for seven long years, and then we will begin again"? Is the world so fixed and stable, are the accordances of feelings and interests so permanent and unchanging, as to make this either reasonable or tolerable? Can any man be found who would voluntarily depute to another for seven years the power of chusing his wine, selecting his butcher and his baker, or determining the dynasty that shall rule over the fashion of his garments? But if it would be hopeless to obtain consent for seven years to such delegations as these, why should it be hoped in the more important operations of delegating to another a man's choice in politics, in religion, and in law?

The truth is, it is not hoped,—it is enforced. The present practice was brought on by a piece of state craft operating upon accidental favourable circumstances; and there is not virtue or wisdom in the public mind to effect the return either to the practice last removed from, or the more rational and ancient one beyond. Every man has a consciousness that his seven years' representative, is no more his representative, for seven years than he is for seventy. He comes in under a storm of promises,—it as it were "hails kissing-comfits,"—but in a few months his ardour is cooled; he whips himself up into a drowsy after-dinner oration once in a year or it may be in two, and assumes some of the airs of a penitent sinner when it occurs to him his course is nearly run. But for any real and operative connexion of views and interests, it is as non-existent as pains taken can make it. The organization is to prevent it, not to secure it. The wonder is not that it should be absent, but that it should ever, to any effectual purpose, be there.

But if this be the folly of long parliaments, what is the folly of having parliament by halves? Of proclaiming to all the powers whose movements are to be checked by the people's voice, in its parliament such as it is, that they shall have par-

liament half the year, to teach them the importance of acting without it the other half? For to this does the present practice amount. One half the year the minister is to be cautious, moderate, and held in check by the people's voice liable to break out upon him through some unruly member when he least desires. Pass but some weary weeks in a dull war of words, and then comes the minister's holyday, his "dulce domum," when fear of popular rod is none, and the voice of rebuke is not to be dreaded in his haunts. Is this wisdom; is it sense; is it the contrivance of men going about to compass a reasonable end by reasonable means?

We have all heard of the "constitution not having been struck out at a heat." When did the power of new heatings cease; and why not try another heat or two again? Surely if reason was given to man for his guidance, there are points on which alteration is needed. Our ships, our carriages, our machinery, are in a state of continual alteration; why not alter the rigging of the state vessel also, when there are manifest indications of the incompetence of the ancient practice. Nobody runs into danger by the experiment elsewhere; there is no instance of any man having brought swift destruction upon himself by trying to stop a leak that made him uncomfortable, or oil an axle that grieved him with its creaking. In everything but politics, reason has its way; and so it has there too, when reasonable heads enough can join in asking for it.

On the whole, perhaps, it will not have been making a bad use of an ill wind, if the lively portions of our countrymen can be induced to add the "Constant Sitting of Parliament" to their habitual demands.

London, 11 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leicestershire Mercury.

No. IV.

WHAT SHALL WE GAIN BY THE SYRIAN WAR?—WILL THE PEOPLE OF LEICESTER BE THE BETTER?

SIR,—The last time I was in Leicester, the streets were occupied with processions of starving workmen, begging assistance to enable them to sustain life for the passing day.

It occurs to me as not impossible, that somebody may start the proposition that the industrious classes will be relieved by the employment given to these men by a war.

Put then the strongest case—stronger a great deal than can happen—but put it for the sake of argument. Suppose that

every one of these men without exception, was immediately enlisted for purposes of war, and placed on full pay and allowances, well fed and wholesomely clad, and provided with shelter and needful fuel.

I want to know whether the industrious classes in general, and those of Leicester in particular, will be the better for it?

And first, where will the money come from, which is laid out on the comforts of these new recruits? From taxes; and these must be paid by somebody.

Would the persons who are to pay these taxes, have spent the amount if it had been left with themselves? There is no doubt of it.

Can they spend it themselves and pay it for taxes too? Evidently not.

Then if this money is laid out in maintenance for the soldier, the payer of the taxes must lay out so much less for himself? Undoubtedly.

He, then, must suffer. But is he all?

If in a ship with a limited stock of provisions for her voyage, a body of passengers who had been on half or quarter allowance before, were by a new mode of division to be served with full allowance of all kinds,—from what quarter must this increase be drawn? Clearly from some of those who got full allowance before. But the rich will always get full allowance; therefore it must come from the poor.

Just as plain, then, it seems to be, that if the unemployed labourers at Leicester, and every other of the manufacturing towns, were all made soldiers of, and put on full instead of famine allowance, this must, as long as the whole quantity of food in the country is to be limited to what can be produced upon the landlords' acres, be raised by a diminution of the allowance which will be compassed by some other people. And if it is replied, that all this is very humane and as it ought to be, I will answer, that it is all nothing but what could be done at Leicester now, if the employed labourers thought it a duty to snatch their small loaf from their children's hands, to share it with the unemployed; and that whether it is a duty or not, it proves what I set out with,—that a war can do nothing for the labouring population of the country generally, and consequently not for those of Leicester in particular.

It might seem very unnecessary to urge such a point as this. But the industrious and honest portions of mankind, have got so much into the habit of being deluded by their betters, that there is no saying where caution is superfluous.

London, 10 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Manchester Advertiser.

No. VI.

DEMOCRATIC ALLIANCE AGAINST WAR.—WHAT DO OUR RULERS KNOW ABOUT COMMERCE?—WHAT DO OUR RULERS KNOW ABOUT POLITICS?

SIR,—Witnessing your exertions in support of what you denominate the democratic alliance against the folly of war, I am encouraged to proceed with the examination of the extreme unfitness of the hands in which the determination of this serious question is at present lodged.

By war the territorial, commercial, and political safety of a nation, are all, in the expressive French phrase, *révoqués en doute*. That is, they are taken out of the comparatively fixed condition in which they were before, and placed in the condition of depending on something which, if not altogether like the casting of a die, involves a large portion of simple chance along with any practicable portion which can be made subservient to human management and control.

And first, for the *territorial* risks and chances. The Whigs think it matter of high self-congratulation, when they discover that in a distracted country like Syria, a force of five or six thousand men, supported by a naval superiority, can extensively derange the balance which previously existed. But how if the same experiment should be tried against themselves. Imagine some European nation, as Russia, making the trial of a few thousand men in aid of the "brave people" for instance on the borders of the Indus; and see how soon the clap-trap by which the country is now attempted to be swayed, would be turned against them. There is nothing new in a country being in a state where it can be extensively disturbed by the presence of a small foreign force. What precise quantity of foreign force, with a general at their head who was a master of what Napoleon once called *l'arme des proclamations* (the weapon of proclamations), would the ministers agree to trust in Canada or Ireland? Wonderful is the complacency with which the Whigs appeal to the fact that a small force can make a great disturbance, as evidence that the existing government is fair game for foreign interference? If it be true of one, why not of another? If the English may act against a Viceroy who has not the love of all his people, why not the French too? What stores of precedents may our Whigs be laying up against some day of wrath they little dream of!

Upon the subject, then, of territorial danger, what confidence can anybody feel in the present men? When they had all straight before them, for giving examples of the facility with which the world may be ruled by moderate equity, and the dangers which may be escaped by adhering to the line pointed out by the improved feelings of modern civilization and humanity, what have they presented but evidences of total unfitness to lay their hands upon the ark of such a cause? Their headings, their hangings, their shootings of prisoners in cold blood, perpetrated, not by themselves, because it is not the custom, but by their agents; is there anything in Tory history to exceed,—not the crime, for considerations of that kind may be supposed equally despised by both,—but the impolicy, the folly, the spendthrift ignorance, of such ruinous proceedings? To take a single instance,—how many days' pay, of how many officers civil or military, would it take to compensate for the damage, actual or contingent, done to the territorial interests of England in India, by the wanton shooting, the day after an action, of an Indian of rank and family, charged with having defended a portion of a town which the English invaders were carrying by assault, longer (as the military gazettes say in extenuation of the brutality) than the remainder of the place? Put the case that a French or Russian invasion had extended to Edinburgh, and that a British officer of rank and family was called out the day after the assault, and shot like a dog, on a charge of having held out in a portion of the Castle after the rest had yielded. Turn it round in all ways; and without dwelling on the infamy attaching to the French or Russian troops by whom the unmanly murder had been committed or allowed, ask only what would be the merits of the government, what their adaptation for conducting any plan of generous ambition or successful preservation of previous conquest. The natural consequence of such conduct is, that by the last news from India, the country is up in arms, and must be either abandoned, or reconquered at the expense of four millions more; and all this, for a murderous whim. Ought not such a government to have its immediate "*Descendas*," from every man capable of anxiety for the interests committed to it?

And then for *commercial* safety. What do the authors of the present mischief know about commerce? Fancy one of them or of their agents, viewing the map of the country he intended to make the seat of war. Do you think he ever said, "Here there are figs, which are exchanged for British cottons; and here the natives would shave their heads with Sheffield

razors, if they were only allowed to pay in their wheat." The question is not whether he thought of this and nothing else; but whether he thought of it at all. He probably would as soon have thought of turning razor-grinder himself. If he had been interrogated on these subjects, the likelihood is he would have answered like the King in the ballad—

> "Cow-hides, cow-hides, what things be they?
> I marvel what they be!"

Nobles think not of figs; and come no nearer to razors than through their valets. A fair guardianship for honest commerce!

And then for *political* safety; what do these men know of politics? They had not the genius, when placed by the people at the top of things on condition of doing the people's work, to keep up a decent spinning-out of popular improvements, but lapsed at once into sulky refusal to go on. They risk the revival of the revolutionary contest, which if another frost does not come to aid at the right moment, may swallow up every crowned head in Europe; and for what? For some babyish fancy they have taken, about something they could tinker in the sovereign rights of Turkey. At the very outset of their course, they are met by the imminent danger of oversetting the tottering throne of France; and they take no lesson, on the twenty more that may be tottering behind. They know that the Continent of Europe is one great mass of iron and clay; in which the iron waits for nothing but the beginning of the movement, to grind to pieces its inert companion. They know that in every country and in the armies which they trust to, the feeling of popular rights is struggling beneath the surface. And yet they have not sense to let well alone for fear of worse. An ambition has seized them to have it said, that they fired the mine and were answerable for the consequences. Would any reasonable man entrust them with the *political* safety of his country, more than with any of the rest?

In addition to all this, they know that the feeling against them in their own country is furious and fierce. They must be conscious that all the classes who followed them in honest expectation of public advantage, view them with the sensations with which an officer is regarded who has led his troops towards the enemy to join and not to attack. Nobody stays with them, but those who had a finger in the plot.

Such is the position in which we stand at present. With no assembly, popular or unpopular, to check; and with the comfortable assurance that the *coup de main* of ministers may be repeated as often as the sun shall reach the like signs upon

his downward road. The aristocracy have cut the links which bound them to the free and moral portions of the public; it is no fault of yours or mine, if alliances for the good of nations are henceforth democratic.

London, 12 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Nottingham Review.

No. IV.

FACTORY ACT THE COMPROMISE OF A FELONY.

SIR,—I can probably introduce to your readers nothing more valuable, than a very able exposition of the fallacy attaching to what is usually denominated the "Factory Question," from the pages of the *Morning Advertiser*. I have no knowledge of the author; but whoever he is, he has done good service to the explanation of the truth.

'Language cannot furnish a censure more condemnatory of the political system of England, nor a panegyric more commendatory of the industrial character of its people, than is to be found in the fact of a law against the importation of corn being allowed to remain on the statute book, while the legislature is at the same time shamed into the enactment of laws prohibiting the operative from taxing his strength beyond his natural effort in the desperate struggle to maintain an unpauperised existence. The picture is one at which posterity will look with horror and astonishment. On one side the legislature preventing them from labouring to the excess to which their necessities would goad them, in the desire of obtaining by their own exertions the most stinted necessaries of life. To object to the limitation of labour prescribed by the Factory Law, would be considered to evince an inhuman indifference to the sufferings of our overwrought operatives; but to support the Corn Laws, which are the accursed cause of these sufferings, is by the landlords pretended to be the most patriotic act of which a generous mind is susceptible. It is, certainly, a most anomalous proceeding for the legislature, first to resolve that the operative shall not have food below a certain price, and then to resolve that he shall not labour to the extent necessary to pay the cost to which the law has raised his sustenance. The most barbarous despotism never acted with more ill-reasoned and capricious control of human action, than is exemplified in this prostitution of authority to results so diametrically opposite.'—*Morning Advertiser*, 6 *Oct.* 1840.

The case is here so clearly put, as almost to defy further elucidation. The legislators first limit the quantity of corn to

be consumed, by the exclusion of what could be obtained by foreign trade; their object in this being to cause an hour's labour of an operative to be given to them for a less quantity of their corn, or more hours' labour for the same quantity. And then they attempt to preserve appearances, by prohibiting the operative from endeavouring to make up for the deficiency in his support by working extra time. They know well, that the additional time which would thus be given to the service of the landowners, is comparatively small in value; and therefore they expect to get a character for humanity at a cheap rate. They particularly attach themselves to limit the hours of children; because that way makes the greatest show at the least cost. And it further happens, that one set of men cry out for the prohibition upon food, and another for the prohibition upon work; so that the two sets of criers, whether they mean it or not, act as effectually into one another's hands as if they were united in the same individuals.

And here perhaps some of the operatives will angrily ask, whether it would be better that their children should be overworked? It would be better that they should not be overstarved. And it would be better that their fathers should not be so deceivable, as to be bowing down in thankfulness to men for professing to limit the hours of their children's labour, while the same class of men, if not the very individuals, are supporting the prohibition upon food which makes the worker's hour tell for so little bread.

The *Morning Advertiser* calls the Factory Act, the compromise of a felony. And a wretched one it is. It is like the compromise which should be offered by a thief who had stolen your shoes from off your feet, and then engaged not to allow you to hurt yourself with over-walking. You are not only to have little for your hour's work, but care shall be taken that you have few hours too. Your child shall get a tea-spoonful of meal per hour, through the interference of the landowners to prevent its getting more; but every care shall be taken that it does not hurt itself by trying to make the twelve tea-spoonfuls fourteen. And for this you are to thank them!

There is no use in seeing poor men cheated because they like it. On the contrary, there is only the more reason why those who can see into the fraud, should set their faces like a flint to make the others comprehend it. Truly has it been said, that for a nation to escape from bondage, it is sufficient that it wills it. But how if it do not will it? And how if one half wills to take side with the oppressor? This is a

little like the scene in England now. And there is evidently no cure for it, except the wholesome agitation of the question in columns such as yours.

London, 11 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editors of the Sheffield Iris.

No. V.

MEETINGS IN THE MANUFACTURING DISTRICTS AGAINST FOREIGN WARS.—THE MINISTERIAL TAUNT AN INSULT TO THE PEOPLE.

SIRS,—The organ of the war ministry, the *Morning Chronicle*, opens out yesterday (4 Nov.) on the attempts that "are now about being made throughout the country, but more especially the towns in the manufacturing districts, to get up petitions against the administration of our foreign relations."

It begins by stating that according to its understanding, the reasoning of the manufacturing towns is, that being insular, Britain ought in no case to have recourse to arms, except in self-defence.

Without stopping to ask whether this would or would not be a just position, I submit that the position taken by the manufacturing towns is not this, because it is something else.

What the manufacturing towns maintain, is that the war is unjust, dishonourable, in breach of prior conventions which make the veracity of nations, in opposition to the accepted pledges of the English politicians concerned in it, hostile to the interests of the country, and in fact a war against it and not in its behalf.

The *Chronicle* represents them as saying, "What is it to us that Turkey is either torn by intestine wars, or is partitioned by her neighbours—what is it to us that different European powers quarrel about the spoil, and the Continent is involved in war? Our business is to trade, and not to fight."

The business of the manufacturing towns is to fight if their trade is attacked, but not to fight in order that it may be attacked. If Turkey is torn by intestine wars, they deny that they are to pay for the purge that is to set her to rights. They know no business ministers have with the bowels of Turkey; they had better do something for our own.

If the war was to secure the integrity of Turkey against foreign powers, they would support it because it had been agreed to; but it is precisely because the war is not for this, and is in the teeth of agreements instead of in support of them, that they refuse their assent. They believe the tendency of the war to be to destroy the strongest member of the Turkish empire left, and so leave the whole at the mercy of Russia; and they strongly suspect the ministers themselves have found this out by this time, and that Messrs. Bulow and Esterhazy came to tell them so.

But hear more, you of the manufacturing towns. "It might not be difficult to show, that even on the calculations of the most vulgar economy, arrangements by which war may be prevented are not to be despised. Would the commerce of England suffer nothing by a general war?"

The manufacturing towns will not be deceived by so naked a plot as this. They see a war begun, when the difficulty was not to avoid a war, but to find one. They utterly disbelieve either the tendency or the inclination to avoid a war, just as they disbelieve the peaceful intentions of "Swing," when they see him thrusting a fiery stick into a corn-stack. They have seen the utmost danger, which is yet not over, of a general war, and a little war besides; and all this, they are affronted with the information, is from sheer and native anxiety for peace.

But the *Chronicle's* "object is to recommend to these lovers of peace *à tout prix*, to reflect a little whether they are not taking the most likely course to produce war."

Was there ever effrontery, like calling the opposers of a war for which no man can give a reason except the desire of ministers to divert the people from attending to their own concerns,—a war which was to seek, against an old ally and friend of England and Englishmen,—a war against the interests of this country and of India,—was there ever the like of calling the opposers of such a war, lovers of peace *à tout prix?* For the benefit of the unlearned, this means peace "at any price." That is to say, we would have tolerated peace at the hazard of keeping our engagements in the East, which are now broken,—of preserving our commercial connexions with Egypt and with India, which are now destroyed for the personal gratification of a few aristocrats, unless preserved by the magnanimity of the man they are trying to depress. The agent of ministers in the East stopped the communication with India, and afterwards the British merchants resident in Egypt proffered to guarantee the perfect

safety of the passage. In the same spirit the ministers have withdrawn the commercial commissioner from Paris (See the last paragraph in the leader of the *Morning Chronicle* of this day, 5 Nov.). The commerce of England can find no enemy but ministers.

"Appearances in the East are no doubt favourable." That is to say, it is demonstrated, that a fleet, which we pay for, employed against our interests, can do us much mischief.

"And our very irritable neighbours on the other side of the Channel will in all probability reconcile themselves to an arrangement which shall divest the Pacha of Egypt of Syria." If *they* will have something to reconcile themselves to, how much shall *we?* We that have to bear the dishonour of broken promises, and the consciousness of national injustice and disgrace.

"But madness is contagious. If a number of our Liberals get up meetings of the nature of that of the Town Council of Bolton*, fresh food may be given to French excitement now

---

* The following is a copy of the petition adopted at Bolton.—

To the Queen's Most Gracious Majesty.

The Petition of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of the Borough of Bolton.

Sheweth—That your petitioners view with the deepest concern the present alarming state of your Majesty's foreign relations.

That your petitioners lament that circumstances should have arisen which have led to the armed interference of this country in the internal government of another, without the slightest prospect of any advantage being thence derived to your Majesty's subjects, but which, even if successful in accomplishing the objects for which it was avowedly undertaken, is certain to lead to a large addition to the burdens of your Majesty's subjects, which are already almost beyond their power to sustain.

That were any foreign powers forcibly to interfere in the domestic affairs of this country, your petitioners believe that such is the attachment of your Majesty's subjects to your person and government, that they would rise as one man to repel the aggression.

That common justice and true national honour equally demand that this country should avoid pursuing towards any other nation a course of aggression which it would so strongly resist if practised towards itself.

That whilst your petitioners do not doubt the ability of this country to carry on successfully any struggle in which it may be engaged, they cannot refrain from respectfully expressing to your Majesty their conviction that the painful and costly experience of former wars—the insular position of Great Britain—her maritime supremacy—and, above all, her dependence on foreign commerce for the immediate comfort and permanent prosperity of her people—plainly point to the system of non-intervention in the domestic concerns of other nations as the only one calculated to promote and secure her true national interests.

That all former experience has clearly shewn that the system of intervention in the political arrangements of other countries which has so long prevailed in our national councils has been highly injurious to the interests of Great Britain. And that, in the opinion of your petitioners, the war now carrying on by your Majesty's forces in Syria, is injudicious and uncalled for, inasmuch as the objects proposed

on the point of dying out." That is to say, we are to abstain from defending our own interest; lest the French should join us.

The concluding sentences are insulting and meant to be so. See what any of us get by crouching before dishonesty. "The wise men of the north [that is *you*] are too late in the field to prevent interference in the affairs of Turkey and Egypt and Syria, but they may be in time to continue hostilities longer than they would otherwise be continued." The coolness of this, is to be likened to nothing but the man's who declared the whole world mad because it differed with himself. Whig is wisdom; wisdom is only a contraction for Whiggisdom.

This is the conveyancer of pocket-handkerchiefs telling his victim that the less noise he makes the better. It is true that ministers, with the dexterity of the trade, plunged the country into the existing risks under circumstances that precluded any man's preventing it; the more shame for the country if it does not dream of effectually preventing the like again. But there was no policy in throwing this in our teeth. We knew it well enough without. It is the same taunt that was thrown out on the Chinese question in parliament by ministers. "Honourable gentlemen are too late to prevent the throat being cut, therefore what can they want?" We know that ministers have the power of cutting the throat first and reckoning after. And this is precisely what we want to alter.

"Having been patient so long, to their own credit be it spoken, it might be as well to continue patient a little longer. We consider the agitation of these lovers of peace *à tout prix*, anything but seasonable."

So says the artist before alluded to. Agitation at all times he finds "anything but seasonable."

The sneer on "having been patient so long," refers to the quietness with which the manufacturing towns saw the net drawn round them, which was sure to end in some such con-

---

to be attained, whether political or commercial, are wholly inadequate to justify the immense cost which must inevitably be incurred in their attainment.

That your petitioners contemplate with dismay, the prospect of the sufferings and destitution of multitudes of your Majesty's subjects in this neighbourhood through the derangement of our foreign commerce, and the consequent suspension of employment in manufactures which must be the certain result of war, with whatever object undertaken.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray your Majesty, forthwith, to take such measures as will have the effect of securing to your Majesty's subjects the inestimable blessings of peace.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

clusion. Will the nation learn from this, that the most dangerous of all governments, is one in which opposition to evil is virtually bought up, and disunion exists only for what is good? And it is barely possible, that it might expend some remnant and corner of its consideration, on the profound and exquisite folly of leaving the concerns of a whole people to be involved at pleasure by half a dozen individuals, subject to that sort of futile retribution which attends shutting the door when the steed is stolen? Which of the present dangers would have arisen, if England had possessed a representative government in action at its post?

London, 5 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Suffolk Chronicle.

No. V.

NECESSITY FOR A CONSTANT PARLIAMENT.—NO USE IN A CAT THAT IS TO BE SIX MONTHS IN THE COUNTRY.

SIR,—The most urgent use to be made of the passing events, and one to which attention in various parts of the country appears to be effectually attracted, is that we should impress on ourselves and others the necessity of a Representative Government, and one not acting by fits and starts, but continuous as the dangers are against which it is to guard.

What a satire it is, upon that frame and practice of government, which we have been told so often "was not struck out at a heat," but curiously framed by additions from time to time as the profoundest practical wisdom was found to suggest;—that it should thus be found in default, the first time a minister chuses to look for a road to doing mischief without control. Which, in the view of many, will lead to the discovery, that this boasted machine, instead of being the work of art implied in the description given of it, is in reality nothing but the result of successive tinkerings, each arising out of some view to private advantage, but only by accident to the public good.

Through the late operations of the ministry, the necessity of Parliamentary Reform has broken out upon us under a new aspect. The old struggle, and which must go on as much as ever, was for gaining something like a real representation in respect of the composition of what are called the representatives; and to this has been added the new one, for gaining something like such an application of this system of representation, in respect of time and constancy of exercise, as shall

afford a prospect of a reasonable conclusion. The ministers, under the guidance doubtless of the Providence which can bring good out of evil, have set themselves to work upon the demonstration, that not only was our representation a leaky barrel, badly hooped and imperfectly jointed, and with all sorts of passages provided or left, for the letting out of what should be kept in, and the letting in of what should be kept out,—but that it was in truth only half a barrel at all, a vessel which pretended to secure what was entrusted to it for one half of its circuit, but made room for all to run out freely in the other.

To those then who love order and admire division into heads, it is clear that a "*Sixth Point*" has been provided for them by the ministers, in the shape of a demand for the "Constant Sitting of Parliament." We hear of no such thing as an unconstant police; nobody suggests the propriety of letting attacks upon persons and property run on to six months' arrears, for the sake of the burst of zeal with which they will be vindicated when the magistrate has shot his partridges. Everybody knows that the important thing is to depress from hour to hour and to keep down; to allow no accumulation of impunity, and give the least possible encouragement to that operation of the mental faculties, which induces mice and men, to play while the cat is away, in spite of a theoretical intimation that she is at some time to come back. The national bacon is of too much importance, to allow of a cat that is to be six months in the country. No use in talking of the necessity of change of air, or the impossibility of getting proper animals to do the duty unless they are indulged annually with an opportunity of gratifying their natural propensity for game. We have all an intimate conviction, a homely certainty, that if we have not one mouser we could have another, and this with claws as sharp, perhaps sharper, than those which cannot leave rural felicity to be upon their posts. Let those whose comfort and satisfaction are not consistent with keeping guard over the nation's larder, make room for those who are more willing. There is no intent to preclude them from a harmless scouring of the hedges for occasional fresh air, or even the delights of a battue upon the sparrows of a distant corn-stack; but what is objected to as utterly unreasonable is, that instead of taking these innocent indulgences as others do, which is by a composition between their private and their public interests, they should insist on a periodical cessation of the national watch and ward, to accommodate their sports.

Neither cats nor men nor mice, expect to be engaged in such a policy in other instances. Why should two great nations

like France and England, on whose union the world's liberties depend, allow themselves to be at the mercy of any spoiler who has the genius to hit the time when the sentinels of popular representation are withdrawn by order?

London, 11 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the True Scotsman.

No. IV.

NECESSITY FOR CONSTANT SITTING OF PARLIAMENT.—WHAT MINISTERS, AND APPRENTICES, FEAR.

SIR,—Considering you as one of those Chartists who are likely to assist in some day carrying the Charter, I write to you on a subject whose importance appears to be strongly impressed by the circumstances which surround us. As no man knows the value of water till he has gone without it, nor can tell where the shoe pinches till he tries; so we have a right to collect the nature of our wants, from the pressure of the time.

There has been a variation or diversity among our friends, in not knowing whether we stand upon Five points or upon Six. In truth, the sixth point, of those who held to so many, always appeared to have something of the superfluous. To stand upon the *Payment of Members*, when it can be done to-day if people like to pay them, and when all the governments in the world could not prevent the payment from being returned in various ways which would on the whole be prejudicial rather than the contrary,—seemed at all events to be something like throwing away the dignity of a Point.

But I think I could propose a Point to make a Sixth, which without increasing the number to more than is already familiar to the public, should be as well worthy of insertion as any other that is there. And this Sixth Point is, "The Constant Sitting of Parliament." Which I now proceed to support.

If there is any allowed good in a discussion either before a popular assembly or before any assembly at all, it must surely be reasonable that such discussion should be applied to all the proceedings of the government, and not to one-half only, to the exclusion of the other. As well might a ship have no watch on deck half the night, with the understanding that if anything went wrong, there should be an appeal to the proper officers in the morning. If the despotic and arbitrary government of a few is allowed to be an evil; if there be really any good in counsel, and in hearing what can be said on the different sides of a question, and how it affects the various classes of the

community;—what approach to common sense can there be in an arrangement, which says there shall be counsel in such a month, but in such another there shall be none? At one time of the year, nothing shall be done which cannot be canvassed on the instant, and spread before the country on the wings of a hundred gazettes and all the powers of the Post Office. But at another time of the year, a dozen of aristocratical men, whom nobody would willingly trust unchecked with the management of anything but their own purses, shall be tempted to play at pitch-and-toss with the national resources, on the gambling speculation of turning up as many heads as shall procure immunity for their own at a reckoning six months hence. Does any man transact his personal business after such a sort? Let it be granted, that our forefathers jogged on with it. They never got the jog that we have. They never had the inhuman folly of the system driven into their understandings, in the way that has been vouchsafed to us of the present day.

It is not in our own country only, that the absurdity of calling such a system a representative government, has been made manifest. Pains seem to have been taken, to present us with a double view, as of an object placed between two reflectors. At the same time that our ministers, with the cunning of envious shrews, were taking their fill of mischief on the strength of the good man of the house being six months from bringing them to a reckoning, their organs were boasting of their plan to complete the evil before the Chambers in France could be assembled, and then the hope was, that the French people would be less zealous in protesting against what could not be prevented.

Thus it was, that two great nations, formed to do each other all kinds of good, and be the stay and support of the world's reasonable hopes for liberty and civilization, were doomed to be both mocked at once, at the pleasure of a handful of as little worthy individuals as the dice could fall on; and all through the gross and swinish stupidity, of thinking that popular representation was good for half the year and might be dispensed with in the other.

Suppose that in France or England the police were to shut up shop for half the year, but hold out *in terrorem* the apprehension of what might be said by justices and gaolers to thieves after a six months' run. Would anybody see in this the repression of crime; or would it not be an encouragement held out to it by all that the postponement and the uncertainty of inquiry can add to temptation? What minister cares a fig for what a House of Commons may say to him six months after

the fact? A thousand visions float before him, of what he may do by that time, to rally supporters to his misdeeds. All the passions of irregular and loosely-educated men are played upon and tempted. Just as well give the apprentice-boys the money of the firm, under an injunction to make out a balance on the credit side at six months' end. What ministers, and apprentices, fear, is constant looking after, daily investigation, a master that is about their path and about their bed, and whose warnings descend in the shape of motions, or a strap, on the first deviation from the path of right. No use in threatening Black Monday; everybody will laugh at it on Tuesday morning. The neighbours all, would know that such a master was not in earnest, nor ever contemplated things going as they ought.

The people of England are weaker than they have been taken for, if they allow the lesson that has been read them ever to fall to the ground. By the example of two countries it has been impressed upon them, that representative government is a mere pretence, if it is not to be constantly acting and in operation. What are the objections to it, what the benefits of the contrary practice? In all other businesses men must attend the whole year round, or agree on taking turn-and-turn upon their posts as they can settle it. Why not the same common-sense and reason in the business of watching a nation's government? But nobody but the Chartists will take it up. All the rest are looking for somebody to cheat them. The men who made the immediate mischief, the "good reformers" who sold the trust of controlling the existing government for Irish boroughs and the dignity of patting ministers upon the back, are stepping forth, now there is no more harm to be done, and declaring that they too think ministers must be opposed. While there would have been use in it, they flew at the throats of any that recommended it; and now they will "bustle up with unsuccessful speed," and try to introduce themselves to the country's confidence as those that will resist. They will only sell the cause again, and thank God they had a cause to sell. But these men have never made much way with the rugged and less confiding elements of the Working Classes. To the Working Classes then I will entrust and recommend for a Sixth Point, the cherishing of this new branch of the tree of rational liberty, the demand that the sittings of the representative body, if it is to represent us at all, shall be as constant as our dangers are.

London, 11 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Bolton Free Press.

No. VII.

MR. MUNTZ'S THEORY.—RESULTS OF REPEAL OF THE CORN LAWS, IF DONE IN THE WORST POSSIBLE WAY.—SAFETY OF EATING FOREIGN CORN.

SIR,—According to intimation I inclose to you some observations on Mr. Muntz's Letter of the 13th of last month to the Editor of the *Birmingham Journal;* for the sake merely of promoting that discussion by which the truth is ultimately to be shaken out. I trust there will be no danger of my falling under the reproof of the *Journal* for causes like those assigned by it in the instance of the *Corn Law Circular;* and the rather, as I have been shot at of the same archers. And there is the further reason for reserve in my case, that I am a man engaging late in life in inquiries foreign to his previous habits, and more in fact as a branch of mathematics than anything else, and therefore must willingly consent to carry on an amicable controversy, subject at every step to the judgment of those whose lives have been passed in practical familiarity with the questions concerned.

The first passage to which I am attracted for examination, is that which describes the two possible modes of repealing the corn laws,—"directly, by a process which will speedily reduce all property, prices, and wages, to the continental level; or indirectly, by altering the monetary standard, so that the nominal value of the ounce of silver shall accord with the average nominal value of the Winchester bushel of wheat, as it did from 1700 to 1790."

Here is a large assertion to begin with, namely, that to repeal the corn laws directly, would speedily reduce all property, prices, and wages, to the continental level. And of this, it is proposed to ask, where is the proof?

Suppose, then, that the corn laws were repealed in the worst, the most violent, and the most unartistlike method it is possible to devise. Imagine, for instance, that a new power in legislation were suddenly to develope itself, and send the notice of its pleasure to Mark-Lane in the shape of a placard with the words "The Corn Laws have ceased to exist," and the figure of a guillotine at the bottom by way of sharpening obedience. What will commercial men admit would be the consequences; and how far would they go towards "reducing all property, prices; and wages, to the continental level"?

There would be a fall in the price of corn towards the continental level; stopping at the prices which would exceed the

continental by the needful freights, raised again by the amount of rise in the continental prices which would be consequent upon the new demand for continental corn. But before it could be said to stop or become settled at all, the fluctuation and agitation would probably be very great; as is the ordinary consequence when a dam of any kind is removed at once.

There would be great losses to the holders of the corn in hand; and gains to the same amount to those who ate it cheaper than they expected.

The English landlords (except so far as they could throw the loss upon their tenants through the operation of leases or similar agreements,) would lose in money rents what may be roughly stated as the difference of the price of corn; being the self-same thing they had in view to obtain, when they proceeded to raise the price of corn by the exclusion of foreign. Against this must be set off, First, the extent to which they would participate in any fall of money prices which might be the result; an extent far from balancing their monopoly, but not on that account to be neglected altogether. Secondly, the degree in which they would ultimately obtain a demand for the employment of their land, for novel purposes arising out of the altered circumstances of the society; as for instance, for mutton to eat with foreign bread, and garden vegetables with the mutton. Thirdly, the extent to which themselves, as being for the most part heads of families, would share in the general increase of the means of finding profitable engagements for children, which might arise from the permission of foreign commerce.

The farmers would creep out of the loss as fast as they could renew their bargains with the landlords; to a very great extent, but not quite. They would lose to an amount, which would be measured by the quantity of land of such a quality as to be finally thrown out of cultivation by the competition of foreign corn, and by the quantity of farming capital which might cease to be applicable with a profit to what may be called high-dressing on all sorts of land. Against which must be set off, their interest in the three sources of compensation suggested to the landlords.

The loss of the agricultural labourers would be very nearly the same as that of the farmers. If, for example, the trade and business of farmers were in the first instance reduced by five per cent., the trade and business of agricultural labourers would be reduced in about the same proportion. And their prospects of compensation, partial or the contrary, would also be of the same nature.

On the capitalists, overseers, and operatives, engaged in

commercial and manufacturing pursuits, the consequences would be those which any commercial man will comprehend in his own case, as arising from a permission to bring home in return for goods exported, *the foreign produce which is wanted at home and will consequently sell with a profit*, instead of being limited to what will not, or only in an inferior degree. Profits must rise, and wages must rise; unless anybody can satisfy himself with a case of his own, where prohibiting the articles in which he would by choice invest his returns from foreign countries, would increase his profits and his inducement for offering good wages, or where leaving him his own way would diminish them.

That money profits and money wages would come down as well as money prices, is what everybody may feel pretty sure of. But that they would come down *as much* as money prices, is quite a different thing, and one not to be admitted without the most rigorous proof. The reason why things are to be cheaper, is that there is more food to be eaten; and more cannot be eaten, without people getting more of it; and to get more food than before, is to be better paid. Call out any child under the guardianship of the Factory Act, and ask it whether it will have a penny that shall buy one roll, or a halfpenny that shall buy two? And if it halts in its decision, class it with the grown men who cannot discover the weakness of the cry, that their money wages will be lower if they are allowed to eat foreign corn.

That the masters would benefit by the repeal, would be a feeble reason why the men should oppose it. Suppose the demand were on the side of the operatives, and the masters opposed it. Would there be common sense in the masters not finding out, that because the operatives would have better wages, would be no reason why the masters should not have better profits too. In one construction it may be true, that what master or man can take from each other, is so much gained by the party taking. But this does not alter the fact, that what is technically called a "good trade" is for the good of both, and a "bad" the contrary.

The claimants of fixed money incomes would be gainers by the fall of prices; and those who had to pay those claims would be losers to the same amount. Among the losers, the most considerable class would be those who had to pay fixed incomes out of land. And among the gainers, the principal would be those who had money in the funds. On which the questions that will occur, are whether the losers have thence any right to resist the abolition of the general

wrong, or the gainers are doing anything but recover from a privation which ought never to have been imposed on them.

On every one of these heads, it is very likely there are details and minutiæ, which might fill a book for each. But it is submitted to the decision of commercial men in general, upon what has fallen within their view or may do if they look for it, whether the above in the gross are not the consequences which would arise. There is no attempt to underrate either the evil or the good. Nobody has thought of denying, that as no mischief can be removed without some agitation or other, so no agitation is without its share of evil in some quarters. And the worst and most impolitic mode of removing the mischief has been purposely supposed, in order that there might be no pretence for saying that evils were concealed.

But in all this, what proof is there that the process, however badly managed, would have a tendency either "speedily" or at all, to "reduce all property, prices, and wages, to the continental level"? What reducing property to the continental level means, it does not seem easy to define; and perhaps the expression has been accidentally vague. And what is intended by reducing prices and wages to the continental level, can scarcely be clear without some question asked. Does it mean reducing *nominal or money* prices and wages to the continental level? If it does, there seems no difficulty in seeing, that this, taken by itself, is of no consequence to anything. Imagine that by a blow of a fairy's wand, as one of the lady economists has supposed, a fat hen was a penny, as it was in some gone-by time. Surely there is not an operative who could consent to dine on chicken, that does not know that this by itself settles nothing, and that his chance of dining would depend entirely on knowing, what were to be his week's wages, paid in hens. Being admitted then that the question is simply of the quantity of the good things of this world which are to be had in return for what are the wages or profits reckoned in money,—where is the proof or appearance of it, that there is any tendency to approach to the substantial wages and profits existing on the continent, more than to those which may be found existing in the moon, if ever that region is opened to the inspection of political economists?

It is not denied that there *may* be a tendency to approach to the lunar state of things; but we demand the proof. Has any more been given, why we should approach to the continental

condition on the points of wages and profits, in consequence of an introduction of continental corn, than why we should approach to the continental cast of features, adopt the continental tongues, or assume the laws and customs of the continentals? There seems as much of logic in one case as in the other. We eat foreign corn; therefore our faces will grow like those of foreigners. But where is the proof; there is a beginning and a conclusion, but the reason that should bind them together is absent. In the same manner—We eat foreign corn; therefore our wages and profits will be the same as those of foreigners. Why? Where is the proof of connexion more than in the other case? Wages and profits do not depend upon the kind of corn we eat, but upon the quantity of it which can be got by each of us for his day's work. If there is any one thing established in matters of human science, it is that conclusions are not to be received by virtue of a juxta-position of words. There must be an inward power of connexion, shewing *why* an asserted conclusion is to follow upon given premises. If this has been overlooked in the present instance, and it is either here or somewhere else whence it can be produced, it shall be applied to with best sincerity as soon as it is shown.

In the next, with your permission, I will attempt to make a summary of the effects produced by altering the monetary standard, including its operation as a mode of evading or annulling the corn laws; and submit it to the opinion of the same authorities as before.

London, 19 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXXV.

LORD PALMERSTON'S LETTER TO THE FRENCH CABINET.—INSUBORDINATION TO A SOVEREIGN.—APPLICATION TO ENGLISH HISTORY.—RECOGNITION OF TEXAS.

SIR,—I undertake to trouble you with some examination of the Letter of the British Minister for Foreign Affairs to "the French Cabinet," through the medium of the Ambassador, dated on the 2nd of the present month. And the object will be to endeavour to substantiate what difference there is, between the principles avowed and impressed in this document, and those which a Tory ministry shrank from committing themselves to, in the heyday of success which led the Continental powers to the Holy Alliance of 1814.

'M. Thiers says that France, in accepting with a religious fidelity the state of Europe, such as it resulted from treaties (by which it is presumed are understood the treaties of 1815), has understood that the state should not be changed, either for the benefit or *to the detriment* of any existing power. In this understanding her Majesty's government entirely agrees; and her Majesty's government conceives that an arrangement which has for its object to prevent Egypt and Syria from being severed from the Turkish empire is in strict conformity with this understanding, and in accordance both with its letter and with its spirit.'—*Letter of Viscount Palmerston to Lord Granville. Foreign Office, Nov.* 2, 1840. *Morning Chronicle,* 10 *Nov.* 1840.

It does not signify so much to the present argument, what M. Thiers means by what he says, as what the Foreign minister of England means. M. Thiers may or may not intend to represent France as claiming to form an integral part of the Holy Alliance; but it is clear that the English minister affects so to understand him, and throws in his teeth, that the whole operation is strictly and truly upon the Holy Alliance principles to which he assumes that France is made to appeal.

But what is important to us, is that the British minister clearly throws himself as a combatant into one scale;—that he adopts and perseveringly supports the Holy Alliance side, with as much eagerness as if he had been a known and acknowledged element in the business from beginning to end. This comes of taking people into partnership on the strength of a change of name. The cat turned into a woman, leaped out at an interesting moment and resumed her former habits. The Anti-Holy-Alliance portion of the cabinet, if such there be, is in this instance the poor sufferer by the unfortunate espousals.

The British minister is next found "concurring" with the French one, in another verity, to wit that "the sovereign power which rules the whole of the Turkish empire should be able to exert its paramount authority *with entire independence of foreign control,* as fully and completely on the shore of the Red Sea as on that of the Black Sea," &c. "In this opinion her Majesty's government concurs," but is immediately seized with the hallucination of declaring, that "the measures which are now in course of execution by the Four Powers, in regard to Syria, appear to her Majesty's government to be strictly in furtherance of these views."

That is to say, that because there was an agreement to preserve the sovereign power of the Turkish empire in independence of foreign control, the operation of foreign forces in Syria is "strictly in furtherance of these views." Whether there is such a thing in law as proving "her Majesty's govern-

ment" unfit to manage its affairs, is for lawyers to know; but it would go hardly with anybody else, who should have hazarded such a ratiocination before Dr. Haliburton and a jury.

But the question shall not be of the goodness of the argument, but of the importance of the substance maintained. The minister, joke or no joke, has slipped most satisfactorily to himself, into the Holy Alliance harness, and expects us to go on with as great a relish too. He is rubbing his hands in the notion that "her Majesty's government" has glided into the full fruition of the Holy Alliance principle, and nobody shall notice or record the moment of projection. Doubtless "her Majesty's government" is glad to find itself concurring in the positions laid down in M. Thiers' despatch; but the question is yet behind, of whether the people of England when they understand it, will find equal cause for gratulation. Little that distinguishes England from other countries would have been in existence now, if finding something to "concur" with in a foreigner's despatch, had been all that was wanted to enable a minister to get rid of anything he chose.

The British minister next proceeds to contest the assumption of M. Thiers, that the existence of Mohammed Ali in his present condition is a source of strength to the Sultan, and tends to enable the Sultan the better to defend himself against foreign and domestic danger. Because the Whig minister avers,

——'a subject in such a state of insubordination and enmity towards his sovereign, must be a source of weakness and not of strength to that sovereign, and must render him less, instead of more able to defend himself against either foreign or domestic danger, *and must, therefore, according to the principles of M. Thiers' despatch, impair the balance of power.*'

'But the opinion of the Turkish Government, which may be allowed to be a competent judge on this matter, has for some time been, that the continued existence of Mohammed Ali, in his present state of military power, and with his hostile intentions towards the Sultan, is incompatible with the internal peace and integrity of the Ottoman empire, and destructive of the independence of the Sultan as regards his relations with foreign powers; and, undoubtedly, the experience of the last few years has too fully shown that this opinion is not unfounded.'—*Ib.*

Here then is the substance conveyed. There are treaties for preserving the "balance of power;" and John Bull huzzas for the same. But any "insubordination" towards a sovereign, is under the new interpretation volunteered by the minister of England, "a source of weakness to that sovereign," and consequently alters the balance of power and comes within the limits of the treaties. What did the Holy Alliance say more? What did the Holy Alliance say else?

To the curious in such matters, it might be interesting to know, how far the principle is to be carried on all sides, and what the understanding is under which we live. For instance, if there should be an insurrection against the British government in India, would that "be a source of weakness" to sovereign Great Britain, and as such give a claim to the assistance of Austrians and Turks, Cretes and Arabians, in turn? Or if it should be in Ireland;—merely, as the man says who asks for eight-pence, "for information." Or put the case that these treaties could have been shifted back to what Whigs call the "Glorious Revolution;" or to the Civil Wars. In all or any of these instances, would there have existed that "source of weakness" to the sovereign, which the treaties would have provided for putting down by foreign armies?

Fancy, for mere curiosity, that our Civil Wars had wound up with a paragraph taken from the despatch of the Whig minister, with only the substitution of "the Parliament" for "Mohammed Ali," "King" for "Sultan," and "British" for "Ottoman" or "Turkish."

'The extent of the limits within which it may be necessary to confine the delegated power of the Parliament, in order to make it probable that for the future they may be obedient instead of disobedient subjects, and may, therefore, become a source of strength, instead of being a cause of weakness to the British empire, is a point upon which opinions may differ; and that question it is not requisite for me now to discuss. But her Majesty's government conceives that whatever may be the opinions entertained on this subject by Foreign Powers, such opinions can only serve to regulate the advice which those Powers may tender to the King, or to determine the extent of the assistance which they may be disposed to afford him; but that it rests with the King, as sovereign of the British empire, to decide which of his subjects shall be appointed by him to govern particular portions of his own dominions, and that no Foreign Power has a right to control the King in the discretionary exercise of one of the inherent and essential attributes of independent sovereignty.'

It is no answer to say Mohammed Ali is not the British Parliament. He is the spirit of political change, embodying itself in such form as the place and time admit of, in consequence of the misconduct or incompetence of what was once the sovereign power. If the sovereign is to be assisted in deciding who shall govern in particular portions of his own dominions, much more might he be assisted in deciding who shall help him in governing the whole. If a king were to come from Hanover, we might hear a sermon on the text the Whigs have been so anxious to lay down.

But "her Majesty's government is anxious" there should be no mistake. It feels a fear that an opportunity should be

lost of declaring its new-born adherence to the Holy Alliance principle, through the mere accident of its not being called for. Lest there should not be an occasion it makes one; and concludes as follows.—

'The question of principle which I have thus adverted to may probably not have any practical bearing upon events now in progress, but her Majesty's government has felt anxious that it should not, by silence on this matter leave its opinions liable to be misunderstood.'—*Ib.*

There does not appear to need much comment, to show us where we are. To which may be added the further demonstration of where we *should* have been, if the honesty and determination of the provincial press had not rescued us from the fate of going down in the dark. The phænomenon has been a curious one. The provincial press has marched upon the metropolitan; and may it long preserve the mastery it has asserted. The reasons for the superiority are not invisible. Here, we are in the Seat of the Beast. It is with you in the provinces, that purer air and clearer heads are found. Your intellects are not obfuscated with the vapours which government influence spreads over a metropolis.

P.S. Since the above was written, I find the *Times* announces the recognition of Texas by Lord Palmerston. He cannot endure to see a reforming Pasha occupy Syria; because the principle of legitimacy, which is the same in Turkey as in England, is thereby endangered. But he recognizes the seizure by land-pirates of a province of Mexico for the purpose of establishing negro slavery there; because Mexico is a republic, and therefore no legitimacy can be at stake. If English commerce may be hereafter concerned in Texas, it was already established in Egypt. If England was bound by diplomatic ties to Turkey, Mexico was one of the governments whose establishment might be called the first-born of English liberalism. Surely the hand of God is on these men, and us. This is another thing they dared not have done during the sitting of a parliament.

London, 18 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leicestershire Mercury.

No. V.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE METROPOLITAN AND PROVINCIAL PRESS.

SIR,—Observing your pledges on succeeding to the direction of the *Leicestershire Mercury*, I presume to expatiate before

yourself and readers, on the extended opportunities which exist for a "steady supporter of popular rights," a "faithful advocate of civil and religious freedom," a "determined enemy of oppression," and a "consistent organ of just and liberal sentiments," to serve the cause he has at heart through the medium of the provincial press, in consequence of the stride which that press during late events has made in influence and in activity.

Though England never was in the state of dependence on the metropolis which is exemplified in France, the action of similar causes had to a considerable extent resulted in similar effects. The priority of information on subjects of interest in general, the establishment there of the seats of government and legislation, and the accumulation of means as well as customers of every description, were all causes tending to make the provincial press into a sort of repeating frigates, to what should be thrown out by some or other of the "great admirals" in the metropolitan centre.

But there were counteracting causes on the other side. Imperfect as the national representation may be, it is still true within certain limits, that London is governed from the country, and not the country from London. Agreeable as it might be to a ministry of any description, to experience the connexion between willing and commanding,—the controlling influences which come up from the country are the checks which from time to time impose boundaries to its desires, and oblige it to sacrifice visions of glory to the homelier object of the welfare of the community.

These checks are principally apparent in the form of various members of parliament transmitted by steam-boat and railway at stated seasons to St. Stephen's. But these are far from comprising or representing the whole of the checking material in the country; and the fact that they are only on their post sometimes, is of itself sufficient to establish the necessity of other watch. This watch consists of the jealous and interested community behind; and their immediate sentinels are the provincial press.

In common times, this press might have been content to select and disperse such morsels from the great laboratories in London, as it thought best suited to the appetites of its readers. But a novel scene arose. A ministry which had long given great cause of discontent to its supporters on the question of Reform, at last broke out into the wild and undigested scheme of trying to distract attention from home improvements by glorious war. The spear and corselet which

had long been "high up hung," were to be taken down and dusted, and men were to be withdrawn from attendance on Political Unions by admiration of the plumed helm and "the big war."

To make the attraction surer, the Holy Alliance glories were chosen for revival, and, "not acted these twenty-five years," were to be presented by particular desire of the minister for Foreign Affairs and the true Sultan. But the whole mummery miserably failed. The cunning, however, which had been displayed in filching the expenses when there was no parliament to check, secured the taking of the money; and security on this head is a great point gained.

The daily press was controlled or influenced to such an extent, that of the journals considered Liberal, not one but lent itself with scarcely a verbal reservation to the ministerial purposes; while the "good reformers" in their several domiciles were as mute as fish.

The weekly London press, with one or two exceptions among the junior branches, hesitated and special-pleaded; and it was not till the country liberals had boldly passed the breach, that it got light to guide it on its way.

The business of the country press must now be, what it has gained to keep. The movement may perhaps end in the establishment of an organ in the metropolis, to promote the general end by co-operation there; a position which there might have been supposed great inducement for one of the existing journals to appropriate, but which none of them has had the resolution and the tact to take.

A provincial editor therefore assumes the helm at no ordinary moment, and may be permitted to encourage himself by large prospects of what there is to do. After the failure of a hostile attempt, comes the effort to improve it to the advantage of the other side. There has long been wanted a stirring of the political pool to dip our cripples; and the minister for Foreign Affairs may have been the angel that we waited for. Six months ago an advocate of civil and religious freedom, an enemy of oppression, and an organ of just and liberal sentiments, might have been almost thrown away. Since then, the adversary has made a false move which has restored life and hope to the game on the people's side; and such an ally as promised, comes in the moment for his own success and the general gain.

London, 16 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Manchester Advertiser.

No. VII.

PLAN FOR MAKING MANCHESTER A PORT.—FORTUNES OF A BALE OF MANCHESTER GOODS.

SIR,—I perceive you are going to make Manchester a port. At least so says the "Retired Sailor" who has let go his anchor on Ardwick Green. And, as he asks, *why not?* There can be no doubt of great interest being felt in such a novelty, by all classes in Manchester; down to the little boys and girls, who will have indistinct visions of apes and peacocks, or possibly a grown elephant or giraffe, to be seen landing from their quarters over sea.

But as I heard a Frenchman say on the restoration of the National Guard, "When a man gets a musquet, the next thing he wants is to know what he can do with it,"—so I hope that you, when you get your port, and before you get it, will be wanting to know what it is you are to do with it afterwards. Do you mean the bargain to be this;—that you shall export from your new haven of Manchester any goods you like, and bring back any you like in return, *except the kinds that would pay?* If this is to be the bargain, know it before you make your port. Or if you do not, let there be no complaining if your port does not succeed. Do you think it likely it will succeed, if such is to be the bargain? And such *will* be the bargain, unless you can alter things considerably from what they are at present.

Follow the fortunes of a bale of your Manchester goods, that shall be shipped at your new harbour and sent to any foreign port in search of a market; and let all the men, women, and children who have been engaged in the fabrication, be asked to look on and see how their interests are concerned. For it is to be assumed they will not deny that they *are* concerned. Whether they are contented or not with the portion that befalls them in the shape of wages or profits, they will not see a chance of increasing either, in the goods being returned on the hands of the maker. No instance on earth was ever found, of working people rejoicing and saying, "Heaven be praised, my employer cannot sell his goods. By the favour of Providence, they have been returned upon his hands." There is not a factory child but would perceive, that whether its former condition was good or bad, the consequences of this new event could only descend on it in the

shape of less wages and more hunger, harder hours or smaller pay per hour. Let its former state have been ever so wretched and ever so unjust, this new fact of the goods being returned on hand, could as certainly do no good, and would as certainly produce additional harm, as if it was proposed to add to the pain of a broken limb, by the application of a red-hot poker to the bruise.

Follow then our bale. The captain is hailed to know whence comes he, and answers "Manchester!" and the foreigners run to the map, to see where that port lies. And this being settled, the captain goes on shore, and produces his bale, a sample it may be of five hundred more on board. What will such waistcoat-pieces sell for? So many stivers or groschen per yard. But what would be the use of these at Manchester? Besides, the captain had particular directions to make a freight home as well as out; Manchester will be but half a port, if it cannot bring cargo back. What then will these stivers or groschen buy abroad; or in other words, what sort of an investment can be made for a return cargo, in exchange for the Manchester goods exported? The whole success of the adventure plainly depends on this. The foreign broker then brings his list of prices. Flax, so many groschen; hemp, so many; corn, hides, wood, iron, bones, each so many, or at such a rate. The foreign broker, or corresponding merchant, or whoever it is that does the head-work on the foreign side, runs his eye over the list, and calculates from the last price current what each would bring in England. "Flax, very low in England! Would not be worth taking! Prices have risen with the growers! Hemp, very little better! Iron, worse and worse! Bones, we could get you a few coffins-full; but they are all gone to Hull. Wood, good! dirt-cheap here! Could fill you up with wood, for next to nothing! Corn, better still! Prodigious high, I see in England; how rich you English must be, to pay so high for all you eat! Bless me, we could not stand it! Wheat, 61*s.* 7*d.* a quarter; only 32*s.* here; *must* pay freight, one would suppose, out of that! Wheat then, it must be; or if it is not ready, a little wood! I know you ship-captains do not like to wait!"

Such might be the sort of conversation going on in a foreign counting-house. And here your captain from the port of Manchester has to reply with representing, that it might all be very well, but it happens by pure ill-luck, and without design on the part of anybody in the world, that the things which would pay at Manchester are the very things on which a

tax has been laid at home. "Wheat or wood, there is no use talking of! Get us half a cargo of bones if you can; and we must fill up with anything else that there will be least loss on! A strange way of trading this; what the d—l did the owners mean by sending us out here with their bales of rags, when they knew there were taxes laid on purpose to hinder us from bringing back the things that would pay! Good-bye, Mynheer; I hope you will see no more ships from the port of Manchester! A ship-captain does not like to wait; but he likes still less to go home with a losing cargo!"

And next for what takes place when your ship comes back. "Captain, what success?" "The old thing, as the Irishman said; worse and worse! No fault of mine;—half cargo home;—bones and stuff! Plenty of things that would pay; taxes will not let! Surely they might contrive to tax people, and let trade be free to help to pay with; but that is land knowledge, and above a seaman's hands! But after all, it *is* desperately hard! I know you will send me no more; and as an honest man I should be sorry to ask you! You must shut up shop; hope you have given no orders, taken on no hands, on the strength of what I was to do for you! More need turn off what you had! Better work five days a-week, than work six and lose money by it! If foremast-men were members of parliament, which I suppose they never will be, you would have better laws for a commercial nation than you have now! I wonder you cotton-spinning people could not mend it!"

Is this, or is it not, an intelligible statement of the way in which your port is to be rendered useless, if you go to work under the present condition of things? Stand up, all on the other side, and say where you find compensation to "Manchester men," for the damage thus inflicted on them; and be very particular in informing them, why you wish this system to go on, and what good thing it is for the sake of which you would postpone its removal. Never mind whether the man who asked you, ever made a "*cop*" of cotton or not; the best "*cop*" that was ever made, did not make the maker tell you any better how your goods were to be sold, nor what it was that hindered its being done. Wait with your port, till what you are to make and carry from it may be sold. Or at all events, take measures that by the time it is ready, foreign trade shall be declared legitimate by Act of Parliament.

London, 19 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Nottingham Review.

No. V.

JUSTICE OF UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.—INTEREST THE MIDDLE CLASSES HAVE IN IT.

SIR,—It is much to be regretted if the Leeds Reform Association have omitted to recognize the justice of Universal Suffrage. Because this seems to afford the only reasonable outlet for showing why anybody should join in obtaining an intermediate step. If an objector says he does not want any intermediate step, this answer may do for him but not for the Leeds Association; because the Association avowed that they *did* desire some intermediate step, and wished to persuade others to join in obtaining it.

If there are men who maintain or believe, that if we were possessed of all power, it would be desirable to use it to make certain people have the suffrage and certain people not have it; their reasons must be founded on the assumption, that the rejected classes would do more harm to others if they should obtain the suffrage, than others would do to them if they have it not. And the weakness of this resides in not noticing, that the classes likely to be rejected, would have very little chance of doing mischief given to them by the possession of the suffrage, while the other classes have very great power and inclination to do harm to those who have no suffrage to defend themselves withal.

The great and grievous error of what go by the name of the middle classes, is in not perceiving that in the main and to all honest purposes, the interests of the more numerous classes, which are the classes on whom the exclusion of the suffrage always falls, are identical with their own. And the same mistake probably extends itself in some degree to all the various gradations or classes, through which Universal Suffrage can be supposed to be approached. Instead of there being any interest for those who have climbed the ladder to keep others down, their real interest if understood would be to help up others to assist. And when the time comes that this shall be generally known,—which a successful experiment or two might wonderfully accelerate,—the process may be expected to make rapid progress.

But if this is the reason why the successful classes are in no real danger from the admission of more, there are on the

other hand very substantial dangers from the feelings of the classes which consider themselves as in a state of hopeless and unjust exclusion. It is certain that they acknowledge little uniformity of interest with the others, and have little disposition to go along with them; an example of which is to be seen in the late or present movements of the injured. If any classes complain of this, they may set it all down as the natural consequence of exclusion, and what would be removed by the removal of the cause.

The danger then from admissions to the suffrage, can at all events only be as the power to do mischief, multiplied by the inclination. And if the tendency is for the inclination to be none at all, the danger must be equally disposed to vanish and be nothing.

But the mischief that may be done, and always has and always will be done, to the classes who have no suffrage to protect themselves with,—in short, the "slave-classes,"—by the others, is matter of such notoriety, present and historical, as to require no elucidation. It is in the nature of man, to carry as little as he can help, and to like to be carried himself. The consequence of which has been in all ages, that one portion of mankind has habitually ridden on the backs of the other. To reduce this inequality in some degree,—to make an approximation to a state where every man should walk on his own legs, if not carry his own baggage,—has been the object of all that have called themselves free governments from the beginning of the world.

On this single principle then, of the interest which the majority of those who already possess the suffrage, have in bringing in more, from the certainty that the majority of these will be in aid,—depends the policy of accepting intermediate steps in the extension of the suffrage. It is not contended that this principle must be found existing in all imaginable circumstances; as, for instance, that if a dozen men only had the right of suffrage, they must necessarily find an interest in extending it. But it is contended that the tendency exists in the actual case; which if it can be established, is enough. And the absence of a corresponding tendency, may in other and different cases be a good reason why the system of accepting intermediate steps, which was politic in one, should not be in the other. For example, there may be no such connexion demonstrable, between accepting a parliament for five years, and obtaining it for three or one. On the contrary, the tendency may be to increase the difficulty of the further step, by having thus lodged in a half-way house.

Whatever may be thought of these or any other arguments upon the subject, there can be little doubt that the question rests on this one point;—has the acceptance of one installment a tendency to make the gaining of another more probable or less? To have settled even this, is something gained towards the advancement of the general question.

London, 18 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editors of the Sheffield Iris.

No. VI.

THE WAR UNJUST, ANTI-NATIONAL, AND DISHONOURABLE.—NEW NOMENCLATURE FOR THE MONTHS.—ATTACK ON THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE.

SIRS,—As the business of sensible men is always "out of the nettle danger, to pluck the flower safety," I take the liberty of endeavouring further to impress the absolute necessity of improving the lesson which has been read to us, for the prevention of future evils.

An enormous expense has been incurred, in a cause totally unjust, anti-national, and dishonourable; in a cause which Englishmen have placed their pride in trampling on, and subserviency to which is the bitterest pill a treacherous government could force upon them; and the bill for all this, to say nothing of the chances of further mischief which are not over, is to be brought in to you and to me, and we are to diminish our comforts, and the comforts of our sons and daughters and posterity for ever, in order to pay our quota towards this unjust and anti-national and dishonourable expenditure.

And we were never asked, either by ourselves or our representatives, for consent. The pretence that we are taxed by consent, is a falsehood of the meanest condition which reference to a dictionary can supply. The men who did it, knew we did not consent, they knew we *would not* consent; and therefore it was they determined to do without. But even they, have not the hardihood to filther the atrocity of affirming, that we are taxed by our consent.

They are in fact great fools, if we are ever taxed by consent again. They have got what in your northern dialect is termed a "*mis-te'ch*," a mis-teaching in the way that they should go, or rather that they should not. The sweetness and the profitableness of misdoing, have been impressed upon them

by experience; as a horse finds he masters a timid rider by a particular trick, and repeats it ever afterwards. The ministers have nothing to do, but spend what they like in the autumn, on bills at six months. The boasted right of supply is put down by these ministers in England by a hocus-pocus, as it was in Canada by a bayonet.

And does anybody think there is the smallest risk attending the performance, at least in present consequences. If we lived in times when some God-fearing man could be found to move, that the expenditure evasively withdrawn from the consent of parliament, be levied on the private property of the ministers in like manner as any monies due by defaulters to her Majesty's Exchequer, there might be hope of salutary repression. But everybody knows we might as well look for Gog and Magog in the House of Commons. The days of giants are gone by, and we are all petty men, fit only to creep between a minister's legs and look up to crave his blessing on our zeal. Do *you* know anybody? Can you point to one that is more likely for such performance, than for carrying off the gates of Gaza on his shoulders if he was sent to the scene of the ministerial crusade? Once more, the ministers are fools, if they do not repeat their *coup de main* on each ensuing autumn. We shall have a new nomenclature for the months. September, October, and November, shall be *Spend-moneth*, *Blood-moneth*, and *Fire-moneth*. December and January, be *Puff-moneth*, and *Swagger-moneth*. And February be *Pay-moneth*, and the rest of the year be called the Palaver Season.

You know as well as I, that we are sold to this or worse, and there is no chance of hindering it, except by that gradual rise of popular opinion, which is heaving up the crust of European society, and which ministers in all countries have no more chance of hindering, than Mrs. Partington of driving out the flood-tide with her mop. It may not be in our days; but it is in our days to point out the remedy which must be pursued.

In all cases of struggle between governments and a popular branch engaged in consequent self-defence, the necessity has been felt for making its sittings *constant*. There is nothing new in the word, and nothing extravagant. Sittings not constant, may do in the case of a moderate government, inclined to abide by the spirit of the laws, and eschewing efforts to depress popular privileges supposed secure, and turn the confidence of the public to the destruction of its rights. But the scene is changed at once, when a government presents itself, eager to break the ties that hold it to the people, curious in putting down one popular right after another, and zealous

in returning to the support of the ancient tyrannies which were supposed abandoned and forgotten. Exactly two centuries ago, the country was in this state; and what is there in the results, that should make present ministers covet the share that may befall them? But vain man is an ass's colt; and the thing that was, is still the thing that shall be.

Let me take you to witness, and ask each of your readers to add his private opinion to the testimony, whether there has been anything in the conduct of the English people, authorizing the attack that has been made upon their established rights, or justifying the opinion that they will finally submit to it. That they will temporarily, there is not the smallest doubt; because in the existing position of the representation of the country, there is no impolicy, no wickedness, that would not find defenders among what call themselves the representatives of the popular cause. But our appeal must be to our grandchildren,—happy is Mr. O'Connell who has his quiver full of them. To them we must bequeath the recollection, that though we lived in an age of weakness and divisions, when men were little but the stuffing for misgovernment to sit upon, we individually had eyes for what was going on, and intelligence to speculate upon the consequences.

And yet we might do something. Will not your "wise men of the north" answer the ministerial taunt, by following the example of their friends at Bolton and at Leeds? No man ever won or saved anything by letting the grass grow under his feet. If the people are to be an element in the government, it is high time the element should stir. There must be more stirring yet; or it is clear there is a disposition to make them the veriest slaves that ever tugged an oar for a master's pleasure. Of all things the strangest, is to hear of a people that will not exert themselves in their own concerns. What other amusement have they in life,—or soon will have, if they will but let alone? If the church preaches against Mr. Lacy*, why does not Mr. Lacy preach against the encroachments of the church in turn? Simply because he has a superintendent over him, to prevent him from doing anything that shall conduce to public liberty. He may enact "Jack Sheppard" if he likes; and any of the ladies of his family may be "Madame Laffarge." But if he attempted anything bearing on the public cause, he would be put down by the authority for that purpose made and provided. Seeing, then, that the people

* A controversy was going on in Sheffield, between the church and Mr. Lacy the manager of the theatre.

and their amusements are warred against in all quarters, why do not they amuse themselves with politics? Let me recommend it to them, as mingling the useful with the sweet; and particularly that in all "choirs and places where they sing" of the Five Points, they would make them Six by striking up a full anthem in behalf of the "CONSTANT SITTING OF PARLIAMENT."

London, 13 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Suffolk Chronicle.

No. VI.

A FREE-TRADE FARMER.—WHAT WERE HIS DIFFICULTIES.

SIR,—The Letter of a "Free Trade Farmer" in your paper of the 14th of this month, is an instance of the progress making in quarters which afford the best-grounded hope for the removal of the national imposition.

The "Farmer" is quite right in his opinion that the way to enable the country to pay the interest of old debts, in other words to pay the fundholders, is not to shut up the resources of the country within a wall, but to give them air and room. And when some minister has genius to find this out too, the mischief will be removed.

If ever a struggle arises on the subject of payment to the fundholders, there will be some remarkable scenes in respect of the sides which different parties will take. The landowners, from symptoms recognized in times past, would be as willing to stop payment to the fundholders if they thought it for their convenience, as to lay a tax on foreign corn. It is from the class denominated "Radicals," with the addition sometimes of "Philosophical," that the resistance has always come, and will again. Deeply penetrated with the fact, that money spent and raised by funding is irrecoverable like any other wasteful expenditure, and that stopping the payment of the interest has no more tendency to recovery, or to any increase of national wealth or power, than authorizing the people on one side the way to take money out of the pockets of those on the other,—they will always oppose such half-witted methods of increasing the national well-being.

What is plain from the language of the "Free Trade Farmer," is that on the whole he is an unbeliever in the farmers' deriving ultimate benefit from the Corn Laws. It might be

doubtful whether the share a farmer has in paying the Bread Tax, may not be in the end deducted from his rent. And it may perhaps be undeniable that the farmers have a certain interest in the increased quantity of land brought into cultivation by the monopoly. What is called a farming-man, might have the same interest that a foreman of printers would have in the prohibition of foreign printed books; but to find an exact parallel for the farmers, it appears necessary to imagine the case, not perhaps very common in actual practice, of a set of manufacturing capitalists who rented some natural advantages or instruments of their trade, as for instance mineral springs from which it was their business to fabricate some chemical substance as vitriol, and who should be offered a prohibition of the foreign article. They would have the firm consciousness that the rent or price of the instrument, the spring, would be raised upon them from time to time as the price of vitriol increased; but they would also have a sentiment that the result would be an increase of the extent, though not the rate, of profits to be made by the class of vitriol-makers on the whole. It is difficult to deny that farmers may have in the first instance an interest of this kind. But on the other hand, there may be causes which reduce it to a nullity or worse. If the "Free Trade Farmer" were asked to state the peculiar sources of disappointment and difficulty he has encountered, would he not enumerate two? First, the pressure of competition in the trade of farmers, running them all one against the other into rack-rents, upon which only the ablest and luckiest can live, and the rest must from time to time be thrown out and forced into some lower condition of life; and secondly, the difficulty, amounting almost to impossibility, of finding advantageous employment for sons, or establishment for daughters, in consequence of the pressure into all imaginable branches of trade or occupation, consequent on confining all that shall be born, to living on the landlords' corn. When the country was open to foreign trade, whether it arose from the absence of prohibitions or from not having yet arrived at the state where prohibitions would be felt, there were always openings for profitable engagements for the rising population, and the population could consequently rise. Now, the man who is concerned in an increase of the population, must keep that increase by dividing with them his own ways and means, and has neither hope nor chance of seeing them increase the family stock, or even support themselves. These are consequences arising in the case of a monopoly of corn, and which do not arise in the case of a monopoly of vitriol; and for this

brief reason, that corn is not vitriol, nor does the absence or diminution of vitriol bring with it the necessary diminution of population which attends on an absence of corn. Men, with very rare exceptions, can live through a famine of vitriol; somebody or other must perish or fail to be, under an absence of corn, whether the parish where it takes place be assigned in the gazette or not.

The most formidable of all dangers for the monopoly of food, is the opposition of individuals in the classes supposed interested in it, who disavow the claim. Allow me to congratulate yourself and the public, on the appearance of such allies.

London, 19 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the True Scotsman.

No. V.

APPEALS TO FORCE.—WHY TO BE REPROBATED.

SIR,—I see two points in the proceedings of the Political Association at Dunfermline, as reported in your paper of the 7th, on which I should be glad to add my portion of support.

The Association have wisely reprobated all appeal to force. And why? Among various other wisdoms which shall not here be insisted on, for this, that their cause was not in a position where force could do other than go against it. There may be positions in which a cause may be advanced by force; and there is no use in affected nicety in avoiding talking of them. We want to know when a cause can be advanced by force, and when not; that we may make our choice to our own advantage, and not the advantage of our enemies. As for the doctrine that *no* good cause can ever be advanced by force, it is one of those assertions which prove too much; and when men find out that it is contrary to the evidence of history and fact, the result will be to make them reject the truth which might have been impressed. All free nations are aware of periods in their history, when much that they possess was secured or obtained by the use of force. But along with this lesson, there has certainly been read another; which is, that what has been gained by force has often turned out less than was expected; that it is a perilous way of gain, and should not be chosen when another would do instead. And so far, this lesson may enter into all speculations on the subject.

But the assertion is, not that force is never wanted at all, but that it is not wanted now. That this is not the time and place for it, any more than fists and arms are in requisition for a game of whist. If they are brought into play, it will be to deprive us of the game we ought to win. Our interest is to keep force out, not to bring it in. We are gaining our ends, on this condition, that we can keep out force. To begin with force ourselves, is like firing our pistols against a fortress, which we wanted simply to pass and be let alone.

And how comes it then, that there is this great superiority of force against us if we insist on running our heads against it, and still we have the prospect of carrying our own points if we let it alone? Mainly from this fact,—that there is a huge mass, perhaps nine-tenths of the community, who will attack us if we break what they call the law, but will not attack us to please somebody else by stopping our operations within the law. A collection of very inert matter they are, having very little political sensibility of any kind; but on the whole perhaps imbued with something of an indistinct notion that things want mending, and we are going the way to do it. But as an oyster is all alive to a touch that enters between the shells, so these political shell-fish are acutely sensible to anything that threatens the compact they call the law, and to which they look for shelter and security. It is only in the single case,—that a terror should arise which made the major part of this dead weight think there was more safety for oysters in breaking the law than in keeping it,—that a sensible politician would look in such a direction for advantage.

But why is it that we, the agitators, are to expect to conduct our movements in safety, though there are very active parties who would willingly go all practicable lengths to hinder us? It is precisely because the inert mass just spoken of, see danger in that also. They have a notion of a certain way of going on, which they have been accustomed to;—they have always heard people talking about rights, and liberties, and charters; and, within certain bounds, they think it very proper it should be so. Within these bounds, therefore, we are safe; and within these bounds it is our business to play the game.

But if the mass are tender on the subject of force being, within certain limits, applied either way,—there is one point on which all their tenderness is concentrated with double violence, and that is, *property*. For property, they live and have their being; and there is no saying they are much to blame; what other good thing have they? But nobody in his senses would begin by tickling them on this sorest place.

Property may be in some instances wrongfully amassed, like the property of highwaymen; and it may be necessary to try to pull this down. But nobody in his wits would so contrive, as to afflict all the dull honest men with an alarm for their property besides. The object is to separate, not to conjoin. We want to get the silly mass upon our side, by showing them how very disagreeable it is to be robbed, and how very likely it is that they may be the next. But the worst of all policies, is to send them over to the robbers' side, in fear and trembling for what they hold themselves.

These seem to be the two great buoys of warning, which past misadventures have caused to be laid down;—not to run against *violence*, not to run against *property*. That those two rocks should be too hard for the ribs that try them, is no argument against the goodness of the vessel, or anything else but the folly of not taking advantage of the experience of the past. If any man gets proud of heart, and insists on what the sailors call "running over all," let him be set down as one who may serve when strength is wanted, but never pretend to rate as a pilot or a master.

London, 16 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Bolton Free Press.

No. VIII.

MR. MUNTZ'S LETTER.—HOW SHALL DEPRECIATION BE ESTIMATED?—WHAT ARE THE FOREIGN EXCHANGES?—TRADE CAN NEVER BE IMPROVED BY CUTTING THE YARD-WAND IN TWO.

SIR,—In continuance of my last,—the *Anti-Corn-law Circular* must surely have been wrong when it stated, that since the time of Elizabeth no nation has resorted to the debasement of the standard to pay its debts; unless it used the words in some restricted sense, as for instance in the sense of a debasement of the *metallic* standard. But the depreciation of the Bank of England note which followed upon 1797, was a depreciation of the standard; because the bank note was made legal tender. Possibly the contending parties have been using the term "standard" in different senses.

On the amount of depreciation which followed upon 1797, and the mode of estimating it, there may be both diversities of opinion, and different modes of notation which may lead to difficulty like the diversity found among military writers

in naming a bank of a river right or left. The greatest depreciation of the note compared with gold, was understood to be indicated by the fact, that the guards of mail-coaches (whom popular report held to be the great agents in what was nominally an illegal traffic) were offering twenty-eight shillings for a guinea, or to put it in another shape, twenty-eight pound notes for twenty guineas, which were at the same time declared by the wisdom of parliament to be equal in value to only twenty-one pound notes. Within ten years afterwards, the Pasha of Egypt was found denouncing rare punishments against any man who should receive tin piastres at more than a dozen for the Spanish dollar; and his error in this respect is possibly among the reasons why he is now to be bombarded. It is pity but somebody could have bombarded the other wiseacres.

Under the circumstances thus described, it is plain that as compared with gold, four pound notes had only the "Act of Parliament" value of three; which is what is usually designated as a depreciation of 25 per cent.; though some have been known to name it a depreciation of 33⅓. If Mr. Muntz's depreciation of 50 per cent. is estimated in the latter manner, it only means what under the other nomenclature would be a depreciation of 33⅓; and consequently the difference between this and the depreciation named of 25, is less than would otherwise appear.

But there may remain the question, whether the depreciation shall be estimated by comparison with gold, or by comparison with "staple articles of the country" as for instance beef and mutton. And the valid reason for fixing on gold appears to be, that the note bore a promise to pay in gold, and not a promise to pay in beef or mutton. The promise to pay to Mr. Abraham Newland or bearer the sum of one pound sterling, meant in the apprehension of all bearers, a promise of twenty twenty-first parts of a golden guinea containing somewhere about a quarter of an ounce of gold, or that twenty-one of the notes should be replaced by twenty guineas on demand; and what men bargain for, that they expect, and not something else. The man who got his twenty twenty-firsts of a quarter of an ounce of gold according to agreement, had no idea of grumbling against the Bank because beef and mutton rose; still less had he the slightest notion of proffering the Bank a discount because beef and mutton fell. To introduce beef and mutton at all, therefore, appears to be a complication nobody thought of at the time the bargain was made. If from any causes there were serious alterations in the

value of gold, (which would be to be gathered from an equable alteration in the gold prices of *all* the commodities in the country), it would seem to be wiser to speak of this under its proper and peculiar name, than to wrap it up under the general term of depreciation, in the same mass with alterations arising from other and totally different causes. For example, there *might* be some mistake in the calculation professed to be derived from all the staple articles of the country; beef and mutton and corn might have been going up, and cottons going down and nothing said about it. It seems much safer to keep every thing in its own compartment.

A paragraph follows which it may conduce to accuracy to begin by copying.—

'For his admission, that, with a debased standard the foreign exchanges would alter according to our alteration, I thank him. He is the first person on that side the question, that I have heard admit it. Upon that fact turns all my argument—that the nominal price of our manufactures will never prejudice our export trade, so long as that nominal price shall be accompanied by such an alteration in the standard of value as shall compensate, by reduction of exchange, for the advance in the nominal price.'

Not being born to the knowledge, I may easily be misty on the subject of foreign exchanges. But is not the principle of what is meant by the foreign exchanges, this? An officer in India saves from time to time a thousand silver rupees, the value of which he wishes to remit to his family in England. He gives the rupees to an agent (which is the Indian name for banker), and asks for a bill on Lombard-Street, to send to his family by next post. How then does the agent determine what the number of pounds sterling expressed in the bill shall be; and why does he on some occasions make this number more, and at others screw up his countenance to a rueful expression, and utter the mystical words "Exchange very bad," as a reason for making it less? Or to make the question shorter, what is it that settles what the agent calls the rate of exchange?

Is not the process neither more nor less than this? The agent, or rather the whole fraternity of agents, keep a sharp look-out on the prices of goods in England and India. And thence they calculate, to the best of their ability, how many pounds sterling the goods purchasable in India with a thousand silver rupees will fetch in England over and above freight and profits. And for this number of pounds sterling the agent gives a bill to his military customer, charging him an agency moreover for the same. If then Indian goods happen

to be selling well in England, he will write down more pounds sterling in the bill; for if not, the officer will find out that somebody else would have done it, and so the agent lose his character and future custom. And the contrary if there is a glut of Indian goods in England, or they are selling ill. And by the same kind of process applied in an inverted direction, the agent will settle how many silver rupees he will give to an officer at sight for a bill of a hundred pounds on Lombard-Street. That is to say, he will judge how many rupees the goods purchasable with a hundred pounds in England will fetch in India, over and above all expenses and profits as before; and this number of rupees he will proffer to his military customer. And as there is no reason why the rates in the two opposite cases should be the same (inasmuch as English goods may be selling very well in India and Indian very badly in England, or the contrary), the fact will generally be that they are different; as officers in India usually discover on comparing notes, and so divide the difference between themselves by exchanging bills for rupees with one another at an intermediate rate. The goods which in all these calculations are supposed to be transmitted, will be the kinds most favourable; for competition drives the agents to offer the best terms they can. And these most favourable goods may sometimes be gold and silver; which must depend upon circumstances, as in the case of any other commodities.

If this is any explanation of the principle of exchanges, the inference seems to be, that debasing the standard in England for instance by 25 per cent, so soon as prices had risen in England proportionably and this was known in India, would cause the agent in India to take his bill and write down forty pounds instead of thirty for the man who brought rupees to sell, and give thirty rupees instead of forty to the man who brought a bill on Lombard-Street.

So far this seems to agree with the first part of the paragraph quoted. But what is the "argument" alluded to in the latter part? Is it simple repetition; or is it intended for something else? There appears reason to apprehend it is intended for something else. Does it not in some shape intend, that something may be done to prevent prejudice to our export trade from high prices, through the invention and subtlety of an alteration in the standard of value?

If it intends this, then all that has preceded has gone to show, that alterations in the standard of value at home, are without substantial effect upon our exports to abroad. Which is another form of the often defended truth, that goods are ulti-

mately exchanged against goods, and standards of value are only instruments of effecting it. If instead of the standard of money value being altered, the length of the yard-wand or the weight of the pound was altered by proclamation every day in the week, nobody can doubt that foreign trade would go on without difference, as fast as the alterations could be ascertained by foreigners and allowed for. There might be gainers or losers in consequence of some of the contracting parties being ignorant of the precise length or weight they were bargaining for; but beyond this, no man will be found to set up a theory that Bolton might gain from foreigners by cutting its yard-wand in two or halving its pound. And as impossible it seems to be, that any ultimate and substantial advantage to export trade would arise from halving the standard of value, and calling a sixpence a shilling.

In all this, there seems little done towards completing the object with which my last concluded. But some useful preparation may possibly have been made.

London, 26 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Dundee Chronicle.

No. I.

SECRET OF A WEAK PARTY'S ADVANCING.—DELUSION OF RUNNING INTO A CORNER.

SIR,—I willingly avail myself of your proposal to admit a weekly letter from me into your pages; hoping that—though no man or set of men can expect to meet with entire uniformity of opinion—we shall still find opportunity for strengthening one another in a common cause.

What I want most earnestly to be allowed to impress upon your readers is, that the cause *is* common, to a vastly greater extent than has ordinarily been conceived. It is not a poor man's cause, nor a rich man's cause,—a working man's cause, nor a leisure man's; but it is all these together, if they have only the grace to find it out.

And this does not go to affirm, that the cause we call the good one has not enemies, and in some classes more extensively than in others; but it declares the existence of a majority in all classes, who are interested in combining for the thing that is right, if they only knew it.

Instead, therefore, of calling for a separate action from one

class, the object of true policy would seem to be, to endeavour to combine all classes in a common aim. Let each class maintain its unity and distinctness, but still let them act together. Manœuvre *as a* regiment, by all means; but manœuvre *with other* regiments, or there is little chance of the success of the campaign.

If I am not much mistaken, in this will be found the secret of any class—and still more an actually weak and depressed class—making the most of the strength it has. Take the working classes, for example. Their political power is very small, and they want more; but they might go on for ever and for ever, in the old way of voting for him of two drink-giving candidates they think the best. Experience proves that in this manner they never got anything in return beyond drink and claptrap, for the most part directed to making them call evil good, and good evil. It is only since the working classes have begun to draw off, and look for institutions and officers of their own, that they have taken any rank at all among contending parties.

But whatever strength they may gain by this, the result must still depend on the way it is applied. If the working classes were to run their heads into a corner, and vow they would act with nobody and go with nobody, the natural consequence would be that nobody would go with them; and the constitution of things in this world, which we cannot alter, is that nothing great shall be accomplished except by union. The secret, then, of a weak party's advancing, is in going with everybody it can, and opposing nobody but those it cannot help; and the weaker the party either from natural or artificial causes, the more necessary this policy is, if it is to be guided by policy at all. Policy means going the best way about a thing, and not the worst. It does not mean any subtle craft, but the manly judgment by which the seaman encounters the shifting storm, and makes his way to the desired port.

Peace, then, should be the policy of a weak party, for this reason, if for none else, that they have nothing to gain by violence. Their object should be, to find out whom they can help, that will help them in return; and so to work themselves onward to influence and power. It is by means of this kind that individuals raise themselves in the world, and so must collections of individuals, which are parties.

And in all this there is nothing that is undignified or mean. The advice is—get power, and use it to get more. But the

first thing is to get it. No use in settling what a man is to do with his money, till he is in some way of seeing it come in. And the same with political power. There is no use in denying that much has been wasted and thrown away; but, like a man who has lost his first guinea, there is nothing to do but begin again. The working classes are increasing in knowledge, which is one main root of power, faster than any other portion of the community. They want, therefore, only to get over a few misfortunes,—which time, that covers everything, will do for them,—and then they have every right to expect to see themselves advance in strength in proportion to their information.

The physical-force delusion seems to have pretty well come to an end, by the trials that have been made. The delusion of running into a corner is the next to be got rid of. If men desire ability to take care of themselves, they must come out and be everywhere seen. They must set it down as a principle, that in everything there is a better and a worse, and their business is to find it out. A sailor advancing against a shifting breeze, presents the true image of a political struggle. When the wind is favourable, he must make the best of his way, and get as far with it as he can; when it is against him, he must hold his own as he is best able, and take advantage of all slants that enable him to lie the nearest to his course. No saying, I will have this wind or none! But stern necessity and honest judgment point out how he is to act.

Heaven is said to help those that help themselves. It also often helps those that help others. Supposing nothing is got by it at all, it is nearly as well as doing no good at home. The stirrers have it all in this world in the end. There is no limit to human disappointments; but still it is true in the main, that the diligent hand maketh rich.

The time is very favourable for setting up a firm of honest men. The world is splitting fast into two parties,—those who are for just and equal government, and those who are against it. Doubts upon who is who, are clearing away like mists before the morning sun. A great deal has been done for us lately, towards removing any difficulties on this head; for which let us be thankful.

Is it unreasonable, then, to hope, that in a place where there are the signs of considerable fusion and agreement among various descriptions of men for the promotion of the just and liberal cause, the appearance of a journal like yours (with which I shall be proud, if this letter is in time, to be connected) will

be the signal for the rapid advance of popular principles within your own borders, and for the multiplication of similar efforts in other quarters?

London, 23 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXXVI.

"Benthamite Crotchets."—Whig Theory of the Happiness of Misery.

Sir,—In the commentary of the ministerial organ (*Morning Chronicle*) on Sir W. Molesworth's speech at the Leeds meeting, were words, if I remember rightly, to this effect; "Nations are governed by their interests, and not by Benthamite crotchets." ···

Now, first, what was meant by Benthamite crotchets? Bentham's assertion was, that the production of the greatest happiness was the only reasonable rule of action. The position of the *Morning Chronicle* therefore is, that nations are governed by their interests and not by what will produce their greatest happiness. Nations therefore have interests distinct from their happiness; they are interested in what diminishes their happiness and consequently makes them miserable; the interest of nations is to be miserable. These are the assertions to which the Whig ministry, through its organ, has set its seal; and if common belief be right, there is no saying from how lofty a quarter in the executive of Great Britain, these profound assertions may not have issued.

"Crotchet" is the word in these days, by which the wicked and the weak designate any opposition to their proceedings. Chastity, with the street-walker, is a crotchet; temperance with the drunkard. The word almost invariably indicates the wrath of simpletons against wiser people. That the greatest happiness should be the rule of government, is in the eyes of our Whig governors a crotchet; that the interest of nations is to be miserable, is the dogma from which all departure appears to them as decidedly ridiculous, as the man without a goitre did to the villagers of the Valais.

And next, what are nations' interests; or to reduce the question to briefer limits, what were intended to be represented as the interests by which the British nation ought to be swayed under existing circumstances, in preference to producing the greatest happiness?

It was intended to be represented, that instead of conducting honest commerce, for which Great Britain is so eminently adapted by locality and habits, it was for the interest of the inhabitants that huge sums should be deducted from the enjoyments which they would have received as the reward of industry, and expended on a worse than useless navy, kept up for no purpose but to bully other nations at the pleasure of a lord or two who may be able to direct it, and with no end but to excite universal enmity by the insolent claim of being stronger for mischief than all the others for defence. The bravo in private life, who should insist on walking the streets with loaded pistols in his belt, and if other men mounted a pair in consequence, feel bound to carry four,—would be but a type of the absurdity. Ask what the bravo gets; suspicion, aversion, enmity, and finally a tripping-up by superior force when opportunity favours and he least expects it. And the same with national bravoes. There has been no specimen of an insolent power of this kind in the world, that has not sooner or later been ground down in the mill of human exasperation. The trade is the most dangerous on earth; the greatest risks and perils of honesty are nothing to it.

After a small and reckless minority have thus made a tolerably well-disposed nation into a kind of political Jack Sheppard,—a convict waiting to be ironed by the first that shall be stronger than he,—the next thing which is represented as an interest far surpassing the interest in the greatest happiness, is that this force so bought and paid for to our loss and damage, should be employed for the destruction of our approved friends, and the support of our worst enemies and the enemies of our fathers before us; by enemies not being meant objects of personal animosity, but defenders of political doctrines which it has been the glory of ourselves and fathers to resist and scout. In such circumstances, surely no man would be found defending the "Benthamite crotchet"!

The next urgent interest commended to us, is that we should insult and quarrel with the strongest and most civilized nation upon earth, trusting to the aid to be derived from various powers in an inferior state of civilization and political freedom. For no man doubts that to summon 500,000 enemies to the frontiers of a country, is an insult and intended to be such; or that the English people would not refrain from taking redress into their own hands for an hour, after a similar insult was addressed to themselves. This makes the third of the invincible interests, compared with which the interest of the greatest happiness is to be but as dust in the balance.

The next substantial interest by which we are all of necessity to be overborne, is the interest we feel in repudiating the expectations of completing the Reform, to which the victory of popular rights in the country we are to attack with 500,000 men, gave the first impetus; and substituting a return to the exploded principles, which led us into a war of which we shall never cease feeling the effects, and whose end, but for an accidental frost, might have been to bring a victorious army instead of "the magnanimous sovereigns" to London. All this we are to bring on over again, or the chances of it; and our interest in it is to be so piercingly acute, that it shall be a "crotchet" in whoever thinks the greatest happiness might have been considered by its side.

Lastly, we are to feel so profoundly interested in all the chances of reaction in our own country, and the possibility that the results or the examples of other nations may lead to widespread and forcible changes and dislocations here, that on this ground also our sensibilities are to be unmanageable, and we are to quite throw overboard the idea of the greatest happiness in comparison of such ravishing expectations. We are to have a new code of desiring and not desiring. We are to desire something which is not happiness, but which the Whigs vouch for as something vastly better. It must be what the poets have spoken of, as "the joy of grief." That we shall be grieved, we have no doubt; but to "keep out the Tories," it is necessary we count it all joy. Or perhaps the secret may be in this. We are to have war, bloodshed, tyranny, and every evil that angry heaven ever rained on men; but we are to "keep out the Tories," and incontinently go on our way rejoicing. The idea that the Whigs are in office, is to be our good in life and our reward in death. We are to reflect that an English lord has laid before a boy Sultan "the banner of a rebellious ex-pasha," and all our bruises are to be healed.

This is the new Whig theory of national felicity, as promulgated by authority. This is what we are invited to adhere to in our own persons, and bequeath to our posterity.

Have not all sensible Englishmen the same interest in pulling down this theory of the happiness of misery, with the system of bluster and plunder on which it rests,—as our forefathers had in dismantling the towers of the grim baron who kept them in vassalage to his designs, and reducing him to walk abroad like an honest man among honest men as his children do? If England is made the bully of Europe, the *grande*

pensée of honest Englishmen must be to reconcile themselves with the European public by ridding themselves of the makers.

London, 25 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leicestershire Mercury.

No. VI.

INVASION OF TEXAS BY AMERICANS.—MR. CANNING'S REPUBLICS.—THE CART-WHIP RECOGNIZED, AND WHY.

SIR,—As a subject which cannot fail to be interesting to many of your readers, I take one connected with that long-standing resistance to Slavery and the Slave-Trade, which liberals of all classes regard as the bright spot which continued to shine through a dark and dreary day when free opinions were almost in abeyance, and perhaps was the guide to the improvement in the public mind which has since been manifested.

An increased interest has been given to the question lately, by the enormous disbursement made by the British people to buy up a wrong, which might with more of justice have been visited on the wrong-doers in the shape of punishment and mulct. The policy was a very disputable one, and owed its completion more to the facility with which men give what they do not pay, than any other cause. But being decided on and reduced to act, it is clear that the payers have a constant right to claim every the remotest consequence which can be attached to the transaction.

One consequence the British public have a clear right to attach, is that after such a powerful declaration of their general hostility to slavery, their government should show itself the constant, earnest, universal enemy of slavery, wherever there is the opportunity of striking it a blow. It is not asserted that the government itself desired this. On the contrary, there was accumulative evidence that the government at the time was acting hostilely, and seeking to obtain the least return for the money instead of the greatest. Its point-blank refusal to make the payment in any proportion contingent upon performance, was evidence sufficient that the government was in a plot. And it is not asserted, that it is not in a plot still. On the contrary, there is but too much reason to believe, that what may be denominated the personal feelings of the government are cold towards the progress of liberty

anywhere. The appeal is not to its inclinations, but to that force behind, by which an honest public opinion has power to drive it, like an unwilling Caliban, into more of good and less of evil.

The United States of America were the quarter where the contest against slavery was going on to the greatest extent, both in ardour and importance; and there it was that the British public had a right to expect their government to operate in favour of the cause the public had adopted, on such occasions as should fall fairly within its reach. An occasion soon arose, from the invasion of Texas by Americans.

When the first symptom of return to liberal principles in the British government displayed itself in Mr. Canning's support of the South American republics, an immediate consequence of their establishment was the abolition of slavery throughout their territories. Here then was a British object gained, more dear to the honest portion of the public than the most "glorious successes" to be obtained in dishonourable war. But the course of freedom was not destined to run clear. Americans from the slave-breeding states began to pour into the province of Texas, which was part of the newly-formed republic of Mexico, and occupy lands. The Mexicans made no objection to their residence, while they obeyed the laws. But as soon as they were strong enough, these degraded descendants of Englishmen announced that slavery was part of their natural rights, and took arms against the Mexicans for its establishment. A Mexican army moved against them, with the President at its head; and as the powers which favour slavery would have it, was defeated and the President taken prisoner. If the British government of the day had possessed the smallest feeling hostile to the re-establishment of slavery in the republics which a former British government had called into existence, the employment of a sloop of war, or the threat of one, to check the communications of the pirates with America by sea, would have enabled the Mexicans to turn the scale; for the American government, divided between the abolitionists of the north and the slave-breeders of the south, did not avow the proceedings of the individuals concerned, or cover them with its flag. A single paragraph from Great Britain, in the shape of public protest and declaration of the facts, would probably have been equally effective. But the hearts of the British government were set upon doing none of these. The struggle went on, and though it was distinctly brought to the notice of ministers by the motion of Mr. Barlow Hoy in the House of Commons in August 1836, no-

thing was the result but those expressions of childish hope that nobody would be very naughty, which grown men always interpret into waiting to see the mischief done.

And the mischief did not fail to be done accordingly. Weakened by internal dissensions, the Mexican republic was foiled in attempting to expel the slave-pirates from her borders. The pseudo-liberal governments of Europe,—in which a pretended sovereignty of popular opinion, is administered by enemies temporizing for the sake of the maximum of effect in the opposite direction,—engaged in hostilities more or less open against the South American republics. The pirates of Texas were taken by the hand, as part and parcel of the opposition to free institutions all over the world. Promises were held out to them, that on attaining a certain probability of permanence to the cart-whip, the cart-whip should be recognized as one of the legal governments of the earth.

To this it is that at this moment the Foreign Minister of Great Britain has chosen to set the seal of his country. The Mexican Republic of Mr. Canning is superseded in Texas, by the slave-breeding *protégés* of Lord Palmerston. A blow in the face is given to every friend of the Abolition of Slavery, and all its enemies exult and crow. The chief reason stated for the recognition of the pirates, is that they are of the Anglo-Saxon race; a plea equally applicable to association with convicted felons as with the unconvict, and in fact the revival of the old claim of the Guinea-men to the slave-trade on the ground of the superiority of the white race.

As one mischief generally hangs by others, it may be interesting to inquire what are the causes and inducements which lead the English ministry to cut themselves off from the affections of a large and influential portion of the country, the enemies of Slavery, at a moment when their conduct in another direction forms so remarkable a contrast. It is not interference they were afraid of; they could employ fleets and armies during the recess of parliament, when the establishment of Turkish legitimacy, and not the depression of negro slavery was in view. It is not the risk of war; for there were on one side only the slave states of America, whom by themselves a brigade of infantry would overturn, and on the other hand the honest feelings of all mankind. What was it then which weighed with Whig ministers, to throw dirt upon the beards of the party in the country, which was most strongly attached to them from grounds distinct from general politics? First, it was the influence of the Slavery party in England, who though seriously beaten on many occasions,

are still lively and strong. But there was another branch. The United States of America, so called, are divided like the sheep and the goats at the last day, upon the Slavery question. The southern states were eager for the establishment of slavery in Texas, as helping them to make head against the power of the northern abolitionists. But the northern states threaten Canada; that is to say, they present themselves as a perpetual contrast to the baneful and sanguinary rule of Great Britain, and so hold forth daily encouragement to the oppressed Canadians to rush into their arms. Hence the eagerness of the misgovernors of Canada, to take side with any thing that is hostile to the northern states. The Whigs recognize the re-establishment of negro slavery in Texas, in aid of securing to a few great houses a monopoly in Canada.

Thus it is that we are made to court dishonour, and pay for the rod that is to bruise us. A monopoly is to be kept up in Canada, in order that money may be extracted for a favoured few, by the process of taking it twice over from the pockets of the nation. And in aid of this, the representatives of honest people at the Queen's court, if such there are, are to be shouldered by the agents of the Texan land-pirates. If a propagandist of "revolutionary principles" had been asked for counsel, what could he have done more towards reducing the respectability of a form of government he did not love?

London, 25 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Manchester Advertiser.

No. VIII.

DEFENSIVE WAR.—THE LITTLE BOYS SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO PLAY AT SETTING FIRE TO THE HOUSE.

SIR,—In consequence of demonstrations which have reached me, of the interest attached by some of your readers to the question of war or peace, I take it up again, at the hazard of repeating what has been said before, but with the chance also of putting something in a clearer light.

And here in the outset, no protest is intended against necessary wars, none against wars in which any just and honest interest is concerned, a high degree of which interest is the nearest it is practicable to come to a definition of necessity. But it *is* intended to protest against war as a profitable trade,

or pleasurable game. Pleasurable it may be to some classes, and profitable to others; but the protest is against its effects upon the whole community which is involved in the consequences.

War to be just must be defensive, either actually or in prospect. So conscious is mankind of this, that on the first remove from the barbarous tribes who live and die in the belief that some other tribes are their natural enemies, and to kill and eat them is acceptable to the great god Kokorooro, all governments are found stating some defensive reasons for war. There is always some wrong done, or doing, or that is to do, brought forward as the pretext; and without this sacrifice to decency on the part of governments, national consciences would not follow, though they may be ready to take the slightest hint for a convincing reason.

A war then, to have any claim to justice, must be of the nature of resistance to a house-breaking. But would any sensible man invite or provoke an attempt to break his house, for the pleasure of resistance? It is possible to imagine the junior branches enjoying, what the communications we are favoured with by ministerial gazettes denominate "the fun;" but there would be few cases in private life, where the wiser elders were not of sufficient vigour to cause the boys to be whipt and sent to bed, if no less summary process was capable of reducing them to quiet. Houses are not built for children to play at defending them, however delightful the occupation in comparison with the duller operations of the school-room or the counting-house.

A propensity of the same kind may be traced in the concerns of nations. They have generally an aristocracy, who are but grown children in respect of serious knowledge and useful experience. Hating for the most part anything that implies industry or labour, as ill-bred boys hate the schoolmaster and the school, the aristocracies on all sides are all agog for opportunities of displaying their malicious activity and their ruinous spirit of adventure. Totally devoid of experience as to the trouble of building houses or raising any other useful construction, they are always ready to make a conflagration for the enjoyment of the struggle. A more dangerous element of society, laborious and honest men could not be in conjunction with; but it is what they everywhere encounter, and therefore they have nothing to do but try to improve the means of keeping it in check.

The object of men in peace, is to raise the means of supporting themselves and families. The object of men in war,

is to raise the means of destroying the support of other men, with an average probability of receiving equal damage in return. The conduct of two nations, therefore, which carry on a useless war against each other, is like the conduct of two cultivators who should agree to burn sheaf for sheaf of each other's harvest or their own, till one gave in. There might be a gain of the pleasure which these cultivators received from watching the progress of the game; but there would certainly be nothing else.

For a commercial nation, then, to allow of a useless war, or one in which it takes the necessity upon trust or the assurance of some aristocrat that he thinks it desirable, is like nothing but allowing the little boys to fire the manufactory for at best the pleasure of putting it out again. A free government has an organization by which it can keep these dangerous youngsters in order. It is plainly inconsistent with common sense, that anybody, young or old, should be allowed to set the factory on fire, without a full council held of all concerned, particularly the owners who must pay; and accordingly in a free government, war can only be undertaken with the consent of the bodies who represent the public freedom. To talk of having engaged in war on the strength of the fancy of Earl This or my Lord That, would, to an unsophisticated citizen of such a government, savour too strongly of universal idiocy for ready belief; he would as soon conceive of a nation's taking a lord's opinion as to the necessity of general suicide, and so putting an end to the public ills at once. But those countries which have not such governments, must wait till they can get them, and in the meantime, as people who were born without hands use their toes, do the best they can with such gifts and instruments as they may happen to have inherited.

Whether the particular war that is or was to be, is anything but a fidget of the little boys who are tired of the dull routine of peace, or who have some view to what may come to them in the confusion, must be settled by the facts. It was a war assured, to prevent a war that nobody could spy even through the government's telescope. Two lords or thereabouts, undertook to see visions and dream dreams; and they announced that without an instant war with a greater in its train, we were to be swallowed up by another somewhere else. They never proved to the satisfaction of man, woman, or child, the danger or even the possibility of that war somewhere else. The whole theory of alarm was fictitious, a pure goblin dressed up in a white sheet. But they had an army and a

navy at command; and by the contemptible deficiency of our frame of government, they had the power of doing the mischief first and reckoning for it afterwards. And so they went to work, like the child that climbs a tree and tears its clothes, in confidence that if it brings down the sparrow's nest its mother will be so pleased she will not whip it. Of such wretched composition are what we call our constitutional guards, and securities for well-being.

Considerations of this kind can never be in better hands than those of the acute and reasoning population of a manufacturing town like yours. The agriculturists may call for war, as the means of superseding the attacks on their monopoly. But your cry should be still for Commerce and for Peace, at all events till something comes nearer hurting us, than an attack on the Grand Turk *viâ* Syria, which nobody believes would ever have been made.

London, 26 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Nottingham Review.

No. VI.

THE FACTORY HOAX.—THE NEGROES' "FISH WITH ONE EYE."

SIR,—From the letter of Mr. R. Birkin in your paper of Nov. 6, I rejoice to see that the manufacturing capitalists of Nottingham or its neighbourhood place the saddle on the right horse, in respect of the source of the sufferings of factory labourers. It is proved by the experience of ages that a life of labour is not necessarily a life of pain; that regular and sustained labour is on the whole rather favourable to happiness than the contrary, in evidence of which, those who have it not by necessity, make it in some way for themselves. The books written by the gentlefolks are full of all manner of laudation of industry and persevering labour among the poor, except when the authors conceit they have an object to gain by crying out against the sufferings of the labourers, as the means of disguising something else.

I know well and of certain knowledge, that sailor boys are ill-used, and soldier boys are ill-used, and I dare say there is no doubt that factory boys and girls are ill-used, in proportion to the causes which tempt their masters to misconduct. But I doubt entirely whether factory children are ill-used more

than others, *except in exact proportion to the exciting causes which the legislature cherishes and nurses for interested purposes of its own.*

There seems to be no inherent reason why manufacturing labour should not be carried on like any other hard labour, by relays of men or whatever else the performers may be. A sailor's life is very hard labour, lasting for all the twenty-four hours, and that for weeks and months together without remission. But it is performed by two relays of men; sometimes by three, which is accounted easy work. It is scarcely possible to imagine why the factory masters should not gladly keep their engines going all the twenty-four hours round, with three relays for men, and four for children;—except for the following fact. The legislators purposely and for their own avowed personal interests, and as the means of maintaining their families in splendour and the sports of the field, (in proof of which it is only a few months since they had a law preventing any but the interested class from being members of the legislature, and no general change or dissolution has taken place,) keep up such a price of food, in other words oblige the operative classes to give them so many hours' work for a peck of corn, that neither man nor child *can* live by working at three relays or four. Their muscles must be taxed to their utmost endurance to pay the monopolizing landlord, and when the half-starved child breaks down under fifteen hours' labour, the canting landlord steps in and offers to make a law by which it shall be allowed to do two-thirds the work, and have two-thirds the bread. The West-Indian planters never did anything so outrageously despotic and unreasonable. The negroes often protested against "fish with one eye," which meant half a salt herring instead of a whole one; but it was never heard that the masters passed laws to prevent voluntary working in the field, of which "fish with one eye" was to be the consequence. "Fish with one eye" is the charity the factory child gets from the tyrants of the soil, under pretence of saving it from too much toil; while the truth is that the other half of the fish is accumulating, in the shape of lace not paid for, on the bosom of the landlord's daughter. We have a legislature formed mainly of corrupt and dishonest men; men not ashamed to sit on a jury where they each took an oath to having a pecuniary interest in the questions they were to decide. And till the country has sense and union to put an end to this horrible mal-practice, the factory child and the factory man must maintain them with their blood.

The knowledge of the truth is fast making way in the country, and fear is coming upon the worse than West-Indian tyrants who live upon the industry of the poor. In Ireland they are obliged to use the armed police to prevent discussion, and rich magistrates band together to put down inquiry into the question. Dissensions, and the exertions of a few individuals who acknowledge themselves to act either from private or political interest, have hitherto kept the working classes in their chains, and even made them assist in begging they might not be removed. But time, that removes all things, will remove this. The day is not far off, when factory labourers at large, will be as wise as their employer who is your correspondent from New Basford.

London, 26 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editors of the Sheffield Iris.

No. VII.

WHAT IS A "WAR MINISTRY."—THE WHIGS AND THE BANNER OF LEGITIMACY.—RECOGNITION OF TEXAS.

SIRS,—In replying to the observations of the *Sheffield Independent* of the 14th of this month, it is only decorous that I should confine myself to the passages in which my own letters have been quoted or alluded to.

The first demand made, is for evidence to justify "describing our government as the 'war ministry.'"

A "war ministry" is a ministry that makes war. Still more is it a ministry that makes war, as one of our own poets sings, "Whether its mother would let it or no." A ministry which is obliged to creep out at the back-door in order to get into a war; which shuffles and puts off, to avoid bringing before parliament and the country a treaty which it knows is to lead to a little war with all the chances of a great one. A ministry which, acting upon no general demand or evidence of necessity, sits cooking something which, as Mr. Buller said, "would be spoilt by publicity," and at last produces a war upon us as its mysterious cutlet,—a war against all our interests, against all our honours, against all our honest prejudices if they *are* prejudices, and directly in the teeth of

all the professions and expectations on which it was raised to power. Am I excusable for the belief, that such a ministry is justly described as "the war ministry"? If it is not, what is it? Is it "the peace ministry"? Is it "the reform ministry"? Will it give us either, or is it ever like to do? The time for doubt is passed; the Whig toad will sit at the ear of no more Eves.

Again, "France has been offended. But does that prove that she has been justly offended?" Where is the monster said it did? But when the further question is asked, "Who *can* review the transactions out of which her anger rose, and not see that it is England, and not France, which has just cause of complaint?"—then many monsters start up, and lay claim to the ability. The monsters say, that according to their judgment and belief, France and England were engaged together, for an object not unreasonable in itself, and consistent enough with what both in France and England are the accepted principles of public liberty; the object, to wit, of preventing the Pasha of Egypt from hazarding a European war by marching on Constantinople. Everybody admitted that this was a fair object, and one which there was no difficulty in securing by negotiation only, with the smallest possible danger of a demand for force. The proof of which is, that it *had been* obtained before, and at a moment of higher temptation than the present, to wit, when the forces of the Pasha had repelled the attack made on them by the Sultan, and there was nothing but the remonstrances of the European powers, which prevented their advance.

Now what would England have said, if while things were going on thus amicably for a common object, it had been announced that France had suddenly been directing her efforts to a new purpose, as for instance (supposing for argument's sake any elements for it had existed) the establishment of a republic one and indivisible in Egypt under the wing of France. The parallel is a very fair one. England, or the power that is at the top of things, does not like new republics. France does not like the resuscitation of the Holy Alliance principle. The last dislike seems quite as reasonable as the other. France has as just a right to dread and to oppose the re-apparition of that principle, as England ever had to oppose what our fathers knew under the name of the Family Compact. What a hubbub would have been raised in England, what a calling upon gods and men, what yells of French perfidy and falsehood, if Bourbon France had been discovered turning a negotiation to prevent a march on Constantinople,

into an attempt to set up in some corner of the world a return towards the principles of the hated Compact!

France's cause of offence, therefore, was about as substantial as any cause could be, short of an actual invasion of her territory. And that can scarcely be said to have been omitted; for it is notorious that one of the first modes of coercion attempted on France through an avowed ministerial organ, was the declaration that 500,000 Germans were collecting on the Rhine. Fancy Englishmen threatened with a revival of the Family Compact and 500,000 men upon the opposite coast to back it, and going about asking opinions "whether anything had been done to threaten the peace!"

The assertion that England is accomplishing "what France professed to desire, but would not concur to bring about," is a mere figure of rhetoric based on confounding the desire of France to prevent or oppose a march on Constantinople, with her consent to seeing the power of the Sultan restored by foreign arms in Syria, as what the English ministry was pleased to propose as the means of doing it. "If that man comes out of his house to attack that other, we'll knock him down," is one thing;—and "Let us go into his house and cut his throat as the means of hindering it," is quite another. The first is what France consented to; the other is the gentle interpolation of our War-Whigs, which France and England are expected to find irresistible.

The weakness of the *Independent's* longer statement of the case is, first, that it is quite a mistake to think it was addressing the friends of foreign interference for "legitimate masters." On the contrary, it was speaking to men who believed all they possessed of political good, to be owing to the fortunate exclusion or defeat of that principle. It was addressing the descendants of men who had defied and set at naught this principle when advanced by France and Spain against their revolutionary rights at home; and who are quite ready to try the game over again if need be in their proper persons, but most radically unwilling to fight or spend a sixpence on the opposite side. This is in fact the great point in dispute. The War-Whigs say we shall fight for the "legitimate mastery" of the Sultan. We say, we would fight both them and their *protégé* sooner; and it remains to be seen, which way the day will go.

And its next weakness is, that there never arose, nor was like to arise, the state of things which was to bring the Russians to Constantinople. There never was the smallest reason to doubt the perfect efficiency of the remonstrances of France and Eng-

land to keep the Pasha from marching there himself, which was the contingency that was to endanger the march of the Russians. It was not, therefore, "a piece of good policy on the part of Lord Palmerston to check Russia;" for there was no Russia to check. Lord Palmerston might as well have announced, that he would drive the French from Alsace, and that he did it to check Russia.

Whether France will go to war or not, is what no man can tell. She is under an anti-national ministry, as we are. The ministries on the two sides of the water are playing into each other's hands, to set up a common wrong, at the expense of the rights and liberties of both nations. Danger enough there is, and will be. Both the French and English people are for the present put down, and popular interests and securities trampled on. The difference between the French and English governments is, that the French government has made no war, and called the Chambers; the English government has made a reckless and dishonourable war, and allowed no Chamber to interfere. If we ask who made this war, one man, or perhaps two, have done it of idiosyncrasy,—which means that peculiarity of constitution by which some men go into ecstatics when they see a cat. One or two lords cannot abide to see a Pasha set up his back against his "legitimate master." And to war they have consequently gone, with less of counsel or of check, than would have taken place in a barbarous horde. How long are we to maintain our place, even by courtesy, among free nations?

But the worst danger by far is yet behind. It is plain that the combat between the popular and the arbitrary principle is coming on again, and that the Whigs have volunteered to carry the banner of "legitimacy." Everybody in France and England must see this, and be taking sides accordingly. Millions on both sides have been spent already without a word of popular consent, by the arbitrary and unlimited rulers (unlimited as far as practice goes) who have chosen it for their pleasure. The mutual confidence of two great nations has been destroyed, and simply because England was for the time under a despotic power, with no control from parliament. And this again, was because the men to whom the people had entrusted the watch on government, had thrown up and bartered control, both actual and in expectation, for the poor bribe of keeping a party in power to which themselves should be attached. But of all this, what must come? One thing certainly, and it has been named. To express it differently,—a strong leaning towards that form of govern-

ment which living experience demonstrates to contain the liveliest elements of popular control. It may be pleasant or not, but *qui veut les moyens, veut la fin;* there is no use in putting a match to a mine, and saying it was not intended to explode. The friends of constitutional monarchy have strained all their nerves to keep down the invidious comparison; when up stand two lords, and insist on its being thrown in the faces of old and young. Truly did the oriental say, "A fly! a grape-stone! the Lord of heaven and earth is never in want of instruments."

For the allusions to my own particular peccadilloes and short-comings, it will be sufficient to reply, that this is not the moment when I am anxious to dismiss any recollections, tending to place me in the position of having been among the first to detect and the nimblest to oppose. The sentries who gave the first alarm, and retired firing afterwards, are not disposed to be penitent, when they find it was all true "and no mistake."

P.S.—It appears the *Times* of this day announces the recognition by Lord Palmerston of Texas. This is another of the things the ministry dared not have done, if parliament had been sitting. They cannot acknowledge Mohammed Ali, and let the British trade already established in Egypt go on in quietness; because that would be contrary to the principles of legitimacy. But they can acknowledge the American land-pirates who seized on Texas from Mexico to establish negro-slavery there; upon pretence of the British trade that is to be. And this because Mexico is only one of Mr. Canning's republics, and consequently no legitimacy is concerned.

Where is to be the end of this system of doing first and reckoning after? Among other things I have just heard that the deficit in the revenue is to be five millions. The constitution would seem to be a kind of Minotaur; half, blind and brutish despotism, tacked to another half of something like human rationality, whose business it is to keep the accounts and pay.

London, 18 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Suffolk Chronicle.

No. VII.

HISTORY OF TEXAS.—MR. BARLOW HOY'S MOTION.—RECOGNITION OF THE LAND-PIRATES.

SIR,—I undertake to write to you on a subject of recent occurrence, in which I know that numbers of the readers of your paper will feel an interest.

The Foreign Minister, in an interval of relaxation from his "glorious successes" in the East, has turned his eyes towards the West, for the purpose of acknowledging and making a treaty with the slave-pirates of Texas.

As some of your readers may be acquainted with the origin of the so-called state of Texas and others not, it may be useful to refer to the records of the House of Commons, where on the 5th of August 1836, Mr. Barlow Hoy brought on a motion for an Address to the King on the subject of the American invasion of that province for the purpose of establishing Negro Slavery there.

The circumstances were briefly these. When Mr. Canning established the independence of the South American republics, the immediate result was a law in each, annihilating the condition of slavery throughout their territories. Numbers of Americans from the slave-breeding States, introduced themselves into the Mexican province of Texas, and occupied lands there; to which the Mexican government appears to have made no forcible objection, as long as they obeyed the laws. But as soon as they are settled in the country, these Americans announce that Americans cannot live unless allowed to bring slavery along with them, and therefore they will stand up for it as one of the "rights of man." And as the powers which protect slavery would have it, they beat a detachment of the Mexican army sent against them, and captured the President of the Mexican republic who was with it.

In this state of things Mr. Barlow Hoy entered his protest, with a view to claiming the interference of the laws of justice and of nations. There was a clear demand upon that general law by which mankind at large are bound to assist one another for putting down the lawless purposes of abandoned individuals; the same law by which an Englishman would feel himself bound to resist a house-breaking in Tombuctoo, or any of the villages where he might have quartered himself on the road. And there was the further claim, of established re-

lationship and patronage between England and the party robbed,—what the ancients would have called a *clientela*,—a compact not written upon parchment, but stamped on the minds of men on both sides, by the recollection of past assistance received on the one, and given by the other. The effort wanted, was almost inappreciable. A quarter of an inch of State Paper would have settled the affair, by the simple demonstration that England would not look on unconcerned. The hundred-thousandth part of the energy displayed by the President of the United States when he declared that the interference of the Holy Allies in the New Continent would be instantly resisted by America, would have brought the whole to an instant end. Or if there had been objections to involving diplomacy in a dispute with pirates, the substitution of a sloop of war with directions to seize piratical vessels landing arms and reinforcements on the coast for Texas, and so reduce the American government to the necessity of either avowing or disavowing, would have produced the same effect.

But none of these was in the minds of the British ministers. Lord Palmerston stood up to reply. He turned off the question to the slave-trade by sea; the matter at issue being whether Americans were to seize Texas for the purpose of carrying on a slave-trade by land. He dwelt on his hopes that America could not, or would not, do anything so wicked as lay hands upon Texas for the purpose of adding it to the Union; the question being whether Americans should or should not seize it now, for the purpose of either adding it to the Union or setting it up as a new and independent Slave State as should be found convenient. The struggle in America was known to be great; the Northern or free States opposing with all their might the creation either directly or indirectly of a new Slave State on the borders of the Union, and the Southern or slave-breeding States equally eager for its establishment, and barely prevented by the opposition of the other from carrying their point of adding it to the Union. He promised great things to be done by and by, towards repressing the Slave Trade in all quarters of the globe, particularly the Portuguese; and in the mean time Americans were to lay hold of Texas for the purpose of establishing the cart-whip. He sank the fact that the insurrection was no Mexican insurrection, but the act of foreigners; for in the army styled insurgent there was only one Mexican, and the despatches of this army were all written in choice American. What an outcry would have been raised, if a similar operation had been carried on with a con-

trary intent; if the Haytians for example had been found thrusting an armed *propagande* into some neighbouring slave-country! How soon would it have been discovered that public law was infringed, and that by a tacit consent of all nations, all had a right to interfere for the repression of such practices! But as it was, all were either asleep or waiting for the consummation of the mischief.

And now the same Foreign Minister takes the moment of his glories in the East, to cheer these land-pirates in the West with the recognition of our dishonoured country. He revolts from acknowledging Mohammed Ali, and letting the English commerce established in Egypt remain in quiet; because that would be contrary to the interests of Turkish "legitimacy." But he can acknowledge the pirates of Texas, on pretence of the Engish commerce that is to be; for Mexico is a republic, and with republics no legitimacy is concerned. He could not employ the threat of a sloop of war, to keep the first-born of English liberality, Mr. Canning's republics, from dismemberment; but he can employ a fleet and army in the absence of parliament, and run up a deficit of five millions to assist in establishing the blind despotism of Turkey.

It may be that it is by act of God, that governors are allowed thus to cut themselves off from the sympathies of one respectable and influential class of the community after another. "For Turkish Despotism and Negro Slavery," is now fairly written on the British flag; and it is for this our naval juveniles are to "run races" with the ingenuous youth of the Austrian marine. A strange conclusion for those who were raised to power as the advocates of "Civil and Religious Liberty all over the world."

In such a time of trial, it will be useful to see which of the professed advocates of Slavery Abolition supported the ministry because they had hopes from them of the mitigation of the great scourge of slavery, and which of them were only joint-stock partners in a great company for keeping themselves in power by the use of the sounding phrases of "humanity" and "freedom."

London, 24 Nov. 1840.

To the Editor of the True Scotsman.

No. VI.

LORD LAUDANUM AND VISCOUNT MORPHINE.—RECOGNITION OF TEXAS.

SIR,—I perceive from an article in your paper, that you "deplore the introduction of a poisonous drug into our commercial speculations;" and further, that there is an "Anti-Opium Society" to which Mr. W. Groser is secretary.

But if so much is distressing to you, what is your opinion of a war being carried on for the purpose of forcing a traffic in opium on a country whose government prohibits it,—and, which you and your readers may think an addition to the interest, *your* having to pay for it?

It is entirely true. When you and your friends and children work hard in your several callings, a portion of it is to buy you bread (and dear), and a portion clothes, and a portion is in order that forty or more opium-merchants in London may put the proceeds of your labour into their pockets, in the shape of profits from an opium-trade carried on by dint of murder and every kind of abomination, paid for out of your toil. Or to put it in a different way,—when your head aches, Mr. Editor, and you cry "O that I could do with an hour less, and take an hour's rest," you are called on for that additional hour, to pay your tribute to your opium-dealing lords and masters, and would not be called on if they were not there. Nor is this all; you will soon be asked for more. There will be a "Lord Laudanum" and a "Viscount Morphine" to pay for shortly; and you will have to keep them and their posterity for ever, or at least to pay your share, out of your aching head and smarting eyes. And those who live by still harder labour, must do the same. The child that brings home its "sair-won penny fee" on Saturday night, has paid a share, which if it could be traced, would be found lodged in the shape of a handful of oats for the carriage-horses of some London opium-dealer, or a tenth of an inch square of lace on the liveries of the footmen of one of my lords aforesaid.

An evening paper commenting upon something connected with Mr. Attwood's proceedings in Paris, dropped a word about "our glorious country." Now I distinctly aver that our country is "inglorious," and point out to you the men who make it so; praying and beseeching you, that you will never be so meanly weak as to be run away with by this claptrap about "glorious country," when you have the feeling in your hearts and in your souls that your country is made a disgrace

and a dishonour, and that honest men only live in it under protest that force is put on them.

Instead of presenting ourselves with a lie in our mouths by calling our country "glorious," it would be much more the act of considerate men to parade it everywhere as "the inglorious," at all events till it has had spirit and sense enough to throw off the men who have brought it to disgrace. And now let me call your attention to another deed of the ministers that rule our "glorious country," which is only chosen because it is the latest; and let me beg of you to mark how rapidly they are cutting themselves off from the affections and support of one class of honest men after another, till at last they will be reduced to a confederacy which it may be hoped will dissolve in its own unsoundness.

They have just acknowledged Texas. Some of your readers perhaps know the facts connected with Texas, and others not. All of them know the efforts which have been made in this country for the suppression of Slavery and the Slave Trade, and how deeply the question is rooted in the minds of every portion of the public but those whose interests are engaged in the promotion of the crime. Many of them will know too, that one of the first symptoms of a movement towards liberal principles in the British government, and of its emancipation from the degrading trammels contracted in the unjust war against France, was the encouragement given by Mr. Canning's administration to the independence of the South American republics, and their consequent release from the grasp of Spain. Among these republics was Mexico; and one of its immediate acts on acquiring independence, was to abolish slavery and declare all men equally citizens. Unfortunately for Mexico its next neighbours were the slave-breeding Americans; and they came down in numbers and occupied land in free Texas. The Mexicans made no objections, as long as they obeyed the laws. But as soon as these American land-pirates thought themselves strong enough, they sent for their slaves from America, and set the Mexicans and their law at defiance. The Mexican President moved against them with an army; and by that fatality which gives victory ordinarily to the worst side, the Mexicans were defeated, and their President taken prisoner. Since that time the Mexicans have been enfeebled by internal disputes, and have been unable to put down the robbers. The employment of a sloop of war by England, or the threat of it, would have restored Texas to Mexico, by preventing the reinforcements to the pirates from America; for the American government could

not openly avow their cause. The ForeignMinister of the Whigs cannot acknowledge Mohammed Ali, because that would be contrary to the interests of "legitimacy" in Turkey. But he can acknowledge the pirates in Texas, because they have only robbed a republic to establish slavery. He cares nothing for British commerce already established in Egypt, which must have been utterly destroyed but for the unparalleled magnanimity of the man he is attacking; but he has a wonderful sensibility for the British commerce that is to be, with the man-stealers of Texas. He could not in conscience permit a sloop of war to prevent the dismemberment of Mexico by pirates; but he can employ a fleet or army upon "tick" without leave of parliament in the other case, and run up a deficit of five millions in the revenue;—for which, if members of parliament had the spirit of apple-women, they would make him and his colleagues answerable according to the laws in existence for defaulters to the Exchequer,—but we know too well what apple-women are, to think of it.

You see how these men, who have betrayed us and gone over to the Holy Alliance, and the almost forgotten carrion of "legitimacy" which our fathers made a jest of, are cutting themselves off piece-meal from the friendly feelings of one class of people in this country after another. There is no doubt they will run their course; and a fearful course it may turn out. But let us secure to ourselves the credit of having neither been frightened nor deceived. You will see in the end what you have got, and what it was the "good reformers" in parliament sold themselves to, to pat upon the back.

London, 25 *Nov.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Bolton Free Press.

No. IX.

DEPRECIATION OF THE STANDARD OF VALUE.—ALTERATIONS IN THE VALUE OF CURRENCY PRODUCE NO GENERAL EFFECT ON THE WEALTH OF A COMMUNITY.

SIR,—The letter of Mr. Muntz proceeds to say—

'I am no advocate, on general principles, for a depreciation of the standard, which I think never ought to be altered, unless the increase of population in the world should be greater than the increase in the quantity of the precious metals, in which case it is quite obvious, that if the standard be persisted in, every one will become poor.'

There is no better general rule, than to doubt everything which is declared to be "quite obvious." Why is it quite obvious? What is there like obviousness about it? Or is it possible by the most complicated reasoning or experiments, to do anything like establishing the assertion?

Suppose the population of the world should double itself a hundred times over, and the quantity of the precious metals never increase at all; or, which would nearly come to the same thing, suppose that the population remaining as it is, the mines of gold and silver should fail to such an extent as would cause the precious metals in the world to be reduced by wear and waste in the contrary proportion. Who would become poor; and in what degree would they approach to everybody? Those who had to pay incomes fixed in money amount, would from time to time become poorer to the extent of the increased value, unless they applied themselves to effect an exchange for something of the nature of a corn-rent; being precisely the converse of the process, by which the paupers of a parish now have very little good of the donation of twenty shillings yearly by a charitable alderman in the time of Elizabeth, unless the legislature or some inferior authority have had the genius at some intermediate period to exchange it for something of the nature intimated. But as this last fact, however melancholy for the sufferers, has not made everybody poor, neither would the other; and by this token among others, that nobody has been made poorer without somebody being at the same time made richer to the same amount, which can be no recipe for making everybody poor. It cannot be this, then, that was meant; it must be something else.

And what was meant, it may be assumed, was, that there would be some effect, or combination of effects, upon the members of the community in general, in the way of making them in the aggregate poorer than they would otherwise have been. That, for instance, there would be some check to the exchange of commodities which is commerce, out of which universal poverty would arise.

Now this is so far from being quite obvious, that there is no danger at all in maintaining it to be demonstrable with very moderate pains, that the only final result of the whole would be, that men would suffer under an extensive infliction of pinchbeck watch-cases and pewter tea-spoons, instead of the articles of gold and silver which were customary luxuries when those metals were more plentiful.

If the value of metallic coins is supposed perpetually to rise, the trader who has bound himself to payment in a certain

number of coins at some specified number of days or weeks hence, will find that he has to pay rather more value than he expected; and the trader to whom the payment is due, will find that he receives rather more value than he had calculated on. Hence there must not only be a balance between the pleasant and unpleasant surprizes of the whole community; but insomuch as every individual is in turn both a payer and receiver, there must be a balance to a certain extent between those of every individual also. The wealth or poverty either of individuals or the public, will therefore in the main be as little affected from this cause, as the wealth or poverty of any trader would be affected by a fancy that should seize his clerks to add a given number of cyphers to every item on the debtor and creditor side of his accounts, with an understanding that the balance also should be expressed with the same amusing addition. Much larger nominal sums would be bandied backward and forward; but it is conceived that the business carried on under them would be much the same as before.

The cause of the mistake, supposing all sinister interests out of the question, appears to be here. There is a confusion between a man's receiving more or less substantial money than he expected, and more or less nominal; and the effects of the one, are assumed to be the same with those of the other. If a man finds himself possessed of ten thousand pounds instead of nine in consequence of a legacy, a remarkable hit in trade, or any similar cause, he has a convincing knowledge that he is the better for it. But it does not follow that he is the better for finding himself possessed of ten thousand pounds instead of nine, if the only reason why he has them is that the ten thousand are worth no more than were the nine. But there is a vague idea of some stimulus to be given to trade and industry, by his taking into the market ten thousand pounds instead of nine. Just as if men would not find out, that ten new pounds which were worth only the old nine, gave precisely the old nine pounds' worth of stimulus and nothing more. And by a converse mistake, there is an impression that nine pounds which should be worth as much as the old ten, would give less than the old ten pounds' worth of stimulus. But it is equally evident that both are misconstructions.

The letter proceeds—

'Neither do I desire to justify the depreciation from 1790 to 1819. It was a fraud upon almost all classes of society at the time; and has been a still greater one upon posterity.'

It was a fraud upon the fundholders, who were robbed of

their interest through the device of giving them a purposely depreciated bank-note, where they had bargained for one of a given value. It was a fraud upon the holders of the circulating medium, to the amount of the commodities received by the fraudulent government in return for the bits of paper which it from time to time threw into the circulation, and refused to pay upon demand as promised on the paper. And there was a fraud greater than all, when the taxes were shifted from an *ad valorem* to a fixed money rate on the articles taxed, as the means of returning to cash payments; the remedy for which is to diminish the expenditure and taxes, but not to return to the old system of robbing the fundholders by a depreciated currency as the means of doing it. Some of the fundholders may have got too much, as may be the case with some dogs where many lap out of a dish; but the fact with respect to them all was, that considering them as an aggregate concern, as would be the case if it were possible to roll them into the person of a single man, the losses of some by the depreciation, and gains of others by the return to cash payments thenceforth for ever, put together left a balance of loss, of the present value of at the least eight millions and a half; as can be proved by those who have the courage to go into the calculation. If these losses are what were in contemplation of the writer, there will be no dispute; but if he meant more, and particularly if he meant anything like the poverty-creating consequences he has ascribed to an *elevation* of the value of the currency, there would be the remarkable circumstance of similar effects being ascribed to two precisely opposite causes; a supposition which, though not invariably impossible, is at all events not to be admitted without rigid proof.

The next sentences look very much as if something of the kind was intended.—

'What I contend for is—that a depreciation did take place; that the relative position of all classes of society was altered by it; that, through the indirect operation of the banks and the corn-laws, that depreciation still continues to three-fourths of its original extent; and that to carry out the 'appreciation' of the standard to the extent of those three-fourths would do infinitely greater injury than to extend to the same standard that existed during the irredeemable paper circulation.'

The evils that have been traced, were hardly of a magnitude, or a perpetuity, to warrant the expression that the relative position of all classes of society was altered by them; the inference from which is, that something further was meant. It is not easy to see how banks can have kept up a depreciation, when gold could be had from them upon demand. That they

took, and continue to take, a portion of the gains from the substitution of paper for gold, which ought to be taken by a National Bank and accounted for to the public like any other public property, may be quite true; but this is another thing from keeping up a depreciation. That the corn laws have caused a great deal of money, or money to the amount of what will buy a great deal of everything else but corn, to be given for a little corn, is precisely what the authors of those laws intended should be the result; but it seems wise to calculate all the consequences of this by themselves, and not wrap them up under the general phrase of a depreciation of the standard, inasmuch as the phænomenon is only an artificial elevation of the price of corn, and the cream of the jest to the authors is, that the prices of other things are to remain the same or at all events not to rise proportionally. But even if from these or any other causes it be true that three-fourths of the original depreciation still exists; it does not appear how its removal being productive of greater evil than returning to the old depreciation altogether, is a reason why the minor poison should be swallowed. Why could not we continue as we are, and swallow neither?

If exercises of this kind, in which nobody lays claim to freedom from mistake, but only to the right of debating before the public, are interesting to your commercial readers, they shall be continued by moderate stages on the remainder of the letter.

London, 1 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Dundee Chronicle.

No. II.

THE TORIES IN PLACE, WITHOUT ITS DANGERS.—LAWS RELATING TO POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS.

SIR,—As my first letter has been favourably received, I can perhaps do nothing better in return, than endeavour to make your Journal, from time to time, an instrument for warning against the dangers with which all exertions for obtaining political improvements are likely to be surrounded.

It must be borne in mind, that we are in a totally different state of prospects and of things from what we were twelve, or even six months ago. The Tory junction had not then been effected, which has now admitted the Tories to the benefits of

place without its dangers. We have made an approach to something like—

> 'That worst of ills that on the conquer'd waits,
> A conqueror's Satrap, thron'd within their gates.'

The Whig ministry are only the conqueror's satrap. The conquerors are the Tories, who have now occupied the citadel, or just so much of it as is for their interests and their necessities. Meanwhile the "good reformers," who have brought things to this pass, are running about trying to pacify people, and represent that though they do not quite like it, there is no real danger in having the Holy Alliance in the garrison. It may have been a fault in the Whig ministry to open the door and ask them in, as it was a fault in Mr. Greenacre to cut his love to pieces, and divide her joint from joint. But the objection to Mr. G.'s policy, as the ablest of the Whig advocates has it, was "exceptional, not general," and it would be very wrong to make it a reason for not giving him a cordial support where we think him right, or for removing him from his place. It is quite evident that the "good reformers" have sold themselves out and out. Perhaps they do not know themselves, but their neighbours do and are well assured, that short of clearing out the House of Commons with the Life Guards, which would be a dear and wasteful way of compassing an end, there is nothing that will startle the "good reformers," or cause them to dream of any dangerous opposition. They will dream of all kinds of opposition that are *not* dangerous. Twos and threes of them will aim at a temporary popularity, by declaring off here and there, where they know there is no danger of being backed. But they will take care it shall be mere sound; they will cautiously avoid all tendency to substantial opposition. They will simper out their personal objection, like a silly girl's "naughty man!"; and the misdoer will only take courage thereby, and feel his conquest more secure. The member for Kilkenny, now the Holy Alliance is in its seat, will move that it is very wrong, and 37 will vote with him, or if it is quite certain there is no danger in it, perhaps a dozen more.

Never have the least doubt that the Whigs must, in the end, do any thing the Tories bid them, or let the Tories come in and do it themselves. And the "good reformers," as they call themselves, will take all quietly, so long as they see the least chance of keeping their party in office by subservience. The game is done; the popular cause is sold. Trial after trial was made, and it was experimentally ascertained that any

liberty might be taken without effectual resistance. At this very hour, those who were the polished arrows in the Whig quiver in the day when resistance might have been practicable, are hawking over the country their feeble non-approval; as the means of qualifying the hostility of some, and securing the maximum of advantage to the party whose retainers they are. The old Holy Alliance of despotism is on its legs again, amidst the cheers and applause of those who hold themselves ill-used if you refuse to call them Radicals. A journal of this class gleefully announces, that it is whispered "a great congress of nations will be held in London, *Paris*, or Vienna, to devise some plan for settling future international disputes without appeals to the sword;" and this, it gravely adds, "would be a mighty step in the way of promoting human happiness." This, mind, is not from a Tory, a Conservative, but from a "good reformer," who would think it scorn not to be called a Radical. And what is this, as such of you know as may remember 1814, but the old Holy Alliance in full dress again? The prevention of international disputes means that the first opposition to the will of the Alliance is to be put down by force of arms. It is the ancient plan for crushing every heave of liberty; and our "good reformers" rejoice and sing for joy. It is not difficult to see to what point we have got. The depression of the spirit of independence as it displayed itself under Mohammed Ali, is to be celebrated as was the greater depression effected by the ruin of Napoleon. The proportions will be what in ancient Rome an ovation bore to a triumph; we shall perhaps escape the "magnanimous sovereigns," but junkettings of their ministers will consecrate the great event. All things will come over again; and possibly not all in little. The real reformers have the Castlereagh days before them again; a brief recess sent us to our beds under the Whigs, and we wake under the Holy Alliance. The people's danger is great. They will be allowed to go on till they have committed themselves to some of the old Tory laws which the Whigs have kept up; and then every good man among them will be seized and quietly sent to Norfolk Island, if the letter of the law will warrant it. In this country we habitually live in the breach of laws, because laws are provided which it is never meant to keep, but only to use as instruments of vengeance on occasion. I remember, for instance, once discovering that I had been living in the commission of transportable offences at the rate of two a-day; my crimes consisting in having intercommuned with Mr. Robert Owen at a time when he was in some state of legal impurity. But this kind of thing must not be risked now. We

are in the hands of bitter and victorious enemies; all our defences have been given up and thrown down, and there is none to help, till Providence shall raise up some quite new scene or state of things which none can guess at. There is none now to say, "*Voilà la Sainte Alliance dissoute!*" We must stand the brunt; and the best thing we can do is to keep out of the line of fire of the enemy.

With these views I introduce to you an article on one portion of the laws provided by the Tories, and which you may depend on it the Holy Alliance Whigs will have in action against you within twelve months if they have the opportunity. It is from the hands of one of the oldest and best-informed of the people's friends; and great dependence may consequently be placed on its accuracy.—

'LAW RELATING TO POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS.

'The Tories, during their half century of misrule, have heaped statute upon statute to prevent associations of the people. The acts which apply to Political Unions are the 39th Geo. III. c. 79, and the 57th Geo. III. c. 19. It will be seen by the following statement, that Tory malevolence and Tory lawyer-craft have been unable to prevent the formation of political associations at the present crisis.

'The act of 39 Geo. III. *prohibited all sorts of correspondence and intercourse between societies whose proceedings were secret; and it also prohibited the appointment of delegates or other officers in all such societies; and it further declared that every such society was an illegal combination and confederacy, and that every member of such society, and every person not a member who held intercourse* with such society, was amenable to the punishments mentioned in the act.

'*It did the same in respect to every political society which had any divisions or branches.*

'It did not prohibit societies which had no secret proceedings, divisions or branches, from holding correspondence with other such societies.

'It did not prohibit the appointment of delegates in such societies, nor meetings of such delegates.

'It was therefore lawful for any society which had no secret proceedings, to correspond in any way it pleased with other societies; and to appoint delegates to meet and transact business with the delegates of other such societies.

'But during the administration of Lord Castlereagh, the liberties of the people, which had been very much abridged during the administration of Mr. Pitt, were thought to be still too great, and it was concluded that the more the intelligence and consequent good conduct of the people increased, the greater was the necessity to destroy their "rights and liberties," and *an act was therefore passed with this intention, subjecting all political societies to the penalties of the act of 39 Geo. III.*

'*No political society can therefore hold correspondence or intercourse with*

any other such society, nor appoint delegates to confer with one another on any matter relating to the society, &c. &c.

'These acts, disgraceful as they are to the legislature and to the nation, do not however prohibit any Union from recommending the establishment of other Unions. They do not prohibit any Union from sending instructions to any body of persons for the formation of other Unions.

'They do not prohibit any Union from appointing delegates to meet persons desirous of forming Unions, and assisting to conduct their proceedings *to the moment the Union is formed*, but all such interference must cease before such Union is declared to be in existence.

'They do not prohibit any one from being a member of as many Unions as he pleases.

'They do not prohibit any one from being a member of the councils of as many Unions as he pleases.

'They do not prohibit any one from saying in any Union, or in the council of any Union, anything he pleases, as a member of the council or Union he is addressing, provided he is not, and does not take upon himself the character of, a delegate.

'Thus every man may see, what he may and what he may not do under these new-fangled laws, which his father or grandfather would have declared the people of Great Britain never would submit to.'

If your immediate friends should not be in actual danger from the source above alluded to, it will not be difficult to find those at no great distance who are.

London, 1 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXXVII.

THE "GREENACRE" POLICY OF MINISTERS AND THEIR DEFENDERS.—HOW OUGHT MR. O'CONNELL'S ASSISTANCE TO BE RECEIVED?

SIR,—The Holy Alliance Whigs are lucky men in the talents of their partisans. They have them of all calibres and capacities, from such as like a blunderbuss can only cast forth what is crammed into them, leaving to Providence what it may hit or miss, to the acute rifleman who can pick his distant object at his ease, and the still more acute professor of projectiles, who can pitch his shells into his object without seeing it at all.

Among the first class of these instruments political, is the ministerial gazette which is simply commanded to emit its joy (*montrer de l'allégresse*, as the celebrated opera direction has it) at the happy prospect of a Holy Alliance Congress in London, Paris, or Vienna. But the more dangerous agent by far is he who will exert a reasoning of his own, in acuteness

perhaps far surpassing what his employers could suggest;—who will take an artist's view of the whole battle, and scorning the preservation of appearances at the expense of realities, endure the wearing of any form and degree of hostility, which shall enable him finally to serve his cause by lulling some alarm, or quashing some tendency to suspicion and resistance.

An ally of this invaluable kind the Holy Alliance Whigs possess, in the ablest of the Sunday journals, which it would be needless to characterize more distinctly. "'T is joy to see," with what a prodigious elasticity their staunch protector can give up all which with important masses of the public he knows to be untenable; and like the professor at Astley's who is left hanging by one heel to the saddle-bow in a situation which the uninitiated would declare utterly hopeless, be found reseated in his saddle in full security, and his protected with him."

A friendly correspondent writes to him, "Do what you think justice fairly calls for, but do not be induced to pass, by the space of one inch, that Taurus which divides us from the common foe."

This, being interpreted, means, "Say as much against any portion of the Whig policy, as you think will mend your own position and gather followers; but when you have got them, lead them in any direction but what shall have a serious tendency to enforce a change, by threatening the whole position of the ministry."

Or, to put the advice in another light, it is like saying, "Denounce as much as you please that error in Mr. Greenacre's* policy, which led him to cut his gentle love to pieces, and convey her in an omnibus a little at a time towards the Regent's Canal; but do not pass, by the space of one inch, that Taurus which divides us from those who would think of building on it a general objection to his character, or removing him from his place."

But as no man is responsible for more of advice given him than he takes, it remains to be seen how much is taken, and how much thrown back with refusal absolute or implied.

The results then, seem to be as follow. The opposition to the Greenacre policy, is declared to have been always "exceptional, not general;" and a disposition and endeavour are avowed, to "confine hostility to the ground which has occasioned it." A determination is expressed to "proceed according

* Greenacre was a criminal whose trial attracted public attention at the time of writing.

to our rule, of giving a cordial support" to the worthy anatomist "where we think him right, and of presenting a strenuous opposition to his errors;" while a later addition directs attention to the fact that the thing by all accounts was "admirably done." Putting all this together, does it not amount to this,—"Let Mr. Greenacre be aware he may do anything he pleases, and no danger of being hanged, as far as we are concerned."

The ministry have committed one of the most insolent and outrageous acts the criminal calendar of ministries can parallel. Taking the moment of darkness and the somnolency of parliament, they have broken their accredited faith and pledges, to the extent of carrying a nation backwards through five-and-twenty years' advances, and lodging it at a point of political degradation, which the grossest Tories at the time of their greatest exaltation, shrank from contemplating; all this accompanied with blood and mangling, and every chance of more, to an extent in comparison of which Mr. Greenacre's disjointings, are as the sacrifice of one little pig compared with the massive slaughters that decorate a Parisian *abattoir*. But for all this the gentle swains must not be unpleasantly flurried. No passing the Taurus which keeps Mr. Greenacre's trachea from the presentiment of uneasy pressure!

This is the amount of the argument as it finally comes from the defender's hands. Great certainly is the obligation of the defended, great or little, to an advocate so cool, so collected, and so staunch.

Not but there are many verities scattered by the way, in the shape of piquant expositions of the "exceptionable policy" into which the client fell. But the intent of protection is visible throughout; they are all only so many admissions to a hostile jury, designed to aid in begging the grand question of impunity at last.

If you ask the object of endeavouring to attract attention to this particular subject now, it is because it presents a brilliant instance of the policy which is to be practised against us, and as such we have a right to make it a stock example for illustration of the game.

But there is a similar object of interest in a different quarter, to which you will perhaps think that my connexion with your journal, now I perceive in what may be termed the eighth "lustre" of our correspondence, will authorize, if not demand, allusion to be made.

I have just seen the letter of the Irish agitator to Mr. Hamer Stansfeld of the 10th of November.

The letter is all very friendly and fair; and no man doubts the Irish leader being a three-decker of that class, whose broadside is very convincing in whatever direction it may be pointed. But what will he do? What can we depend on from him? Is not he too fighting a game to bring off the ministers at a pinch, and serve his own purposes by the way? When by the mixture of his energies he has wrought up ours (for I take the liberty of speaking as your countryman), to the formation on the whole of something powerful and imposing, will he or will he not go to the ministry, or to some ministry, and say, "Now, here is a mass of popular force, able to crush a ministry like the walls of Jericho with the blast of its lungs. Give me my way in Ireland (or as the case may be), and it shall not be set upon you; and if you do not, it shall."

Or, to take another danger, inasmuch as before the fact, is the time for precaution,—will he descant to our Yorkshire brethren, (some of whom make approaches to the *perfervidum ingenium* of the more northern races), on the efficacy of "fourteen thousand men of a fighting age, beginning at fourteen and ending at sixty-five"; and then, if it should chance that among the events yet unrolled by history, they should be attacked by some unforeseen tyranny or other, like the French in the Three Days or the Colonial House of Representatives in Canada, and after being cockered up and their warlike propensities set in motion by oratory as aforesaid, they should attempt resistance like those others or like their forefathers,—will he turn round as he did in the case of Canada, and cry "Naughty, naughty men! Defended themselves against the grenadiers! Shocking, dreadful! Did not know what I meant, that fourteen thousand men were to be got together to keep them out of harm's way!" And will he then go to the ministry and offer three hundred thousand Irish to keep us down? Will he do this; because if he will, we had rather he should not, and would try to hinder him before he begins.

On these and like points, I do not know how you or any of us are to get any satisfaction. Would not the best policy be, to accept his assistance gladly, but with the full confidence that he will do either of the things mentioned if the invitation comes?—to take him as a gun, which you make up your minds will burst some day or other, but by help of which you hope to have a few long and hard shots at the enemy before that time arrives?

You know my habits of plain speaking. I have very little

confidence in anything that goes by the name of wisdom, or power over the future; but I believe plain speaking is as often right as anything else.

London, 3 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leicestershire Mercury.

No. VII.

WHIG WARS FOR THE ARBITRARY PRINCIPLE.—APPARATUS FOR EVIL.

SIR,—As nothing now sounds in our ears but the noise of war, undertaken and carried on, as we believe, in opposition to our interests and the interests of free nations in general, I may be excused for again dwelling upon the topic, in hope of following up the impressions made by the powerful letter of Mr. Biggs in your last number but one.

The mischief of this war is, that it fixes the attention of all the loose and disposable spirits of the country, upon the glory and desirableness of waging war in support of ignorant and absolute power, under the title of sovereignty. There is a sovereign power in England, as there would and must be under any form of government from the freest republic to the blackest despotism; and there is a sovereign power in Turkey, for a reason of the same kind. But it is the interest of all the despotic elements in our mingled state, to cherish the idea of a close similarity and intimacy between our sovereignty and that of Turkey. They view it as a glorious and delightful thing, that the seamen and soldiers whom we pay for, should be accustomed to be laid on the track of blood, wherever a resistance to sovereignty, even like the Turkish, shall be displayed. The war is plainly enough against us, who love not such sovereignties. It is a practice beforehand, or rather a practice to put down the chances of anything hereafter. It is a grand parade of the power of gunpowder to kill a "liberal" man withal, and the hopelessness of resistance where tyrants have combined.

Part of the monstrous impolicy of all this, was in the necessary consequence which it implied, of bringing on a struggle in Europe to restore the *status quo*. A twelvemonth ago, Europe slept, not in satisfaction, but still in a sort of assurance that the balance was in favour of things continuing as they are. Arbitrary principles were on the whole considered

as going down, and the unions of barbarian powers were beginning to be viewed, like the invasions of the Goths and Huns, as matter of history more than of expectation. But all this has been inverted. The principle of union for the support of barbarism and absolutism, has been shown to be as much alive as ever; and the insult has been put on that people who, with one exception, were considered as the most conscious of their interest in the extension of civilization and independence, of proving to them that their bulwarks were in fact straws and rottenness, and that it was not so much as necessary to ask their leave before they were plunged into the disgrace that has befallen them.

Out of all this, it is plain enough what must grow. An attack upon the liberal principle in all countries and situations, according to their circumstances; attended probably in the first instances with much success, but finally repulsed and driven back like the Coalitions of the first Revolutionary War. Whether the principles of freedom will afterwards run pure, or by debasing themselves into views of conquest and violent power, again subject themselves to a reaction in return, is what history, the fruitful record of human infirmity, can only tell as it unrolls.

In our own country, the fatal symptom is, that a fusion has taken place between the friends of the people and their enemies. And it is the friends who have gone over to the enemies, not the enemies to the friends. The Tories are all exultation, in believing (as is true enough) that such things never could have been accomplished but by the Whigs being nominally in power. They boast openly, that but for that, the Whigs would have opposed, as they opposed the Revolutionary War of 1793, and would have summoned all the popular elements to aid in their resistance. It is a grand truth, that there is nothing like treason. It is the most complete and effectual of all the agents that can be employed, if it is only to be had. No game for any party can be so choice, as getting it into the virtual power on pretence of keeping it out;—as setting up a race of fools to bawl for its exclusion, the understanding all along being, that the party to be kept in are pledged to open the gates and join.

This is the great lesson, of which Chapter One has now been rehearsed by the performing parties. What is to be Chapter Two, will show itself in due time. It is difficult to say what it might not be, or what shall not make its appearance in the end. One thing has been distinctly shown,—the utter nullity and falsehood of any pretended popular check or security for

the conduct of the executive. Short of what would have roused actual insurrection, the administration might as well have proceeded to introduce the Cossacks and Baschkirs to alter the frame of government. There was as much of human preparation against one event as against the other. The only question in either case, would have been whether when the mischief was done, it would have sheltered the performers. The constitution and custom of England is, that any minister may make a breach in the fortress of the public welfare, subject to the contingency of being able to cover himself against six months afterwards. It is the opposite of Paley's assertion, that there are no glands for the formation of gout. Here is a direct apparatus diligently made and provided, and which no man will think of altering, for securing all the mischief that can be compassed by the promise of allowing it first and inquiring afterwards.

The disgusting nature of the wars in which it has been the peculiar choice and fortune of our Whigs to engage, with the gratuitous ferocities and uncalled-for gloatings over blood and human misery in which their Ghouls of the press have been directed to indulge, have roused the indignation of a decent public, and will perhaps descend on posterity in the shape of good by the reaction they will produce. For the present, we have been brutalized and dishonoured; every man of us feels shame and regret, that it was our fate to be born in a country liable to be so degraded. And at the bottom of the whole, let us trust, is a burning desire, that Providence would in some way or other bring the guilty to punishment, and if it has a particular favour in reserve for ourselves, make us the instruments. We cannot go on under a government which in civilization and intelligence is markedly inferior to the masses to be governed.

London, 1 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Manchester Advertiser.

No. IX.

GREAT FRAUD ABOUT "RAG MONEY."—ABSURDITY THERE WOULD BE IN PAYING OFF THE NATIONAL DEBT.

SIR,—The observations on paper money in your last number, induce me to notice with feelings of satisfaction, that I am not sure whether I might not pride myself on having done

something towards dissuading the industrious classes or some of them, from the prejudices they had in favour of increasing the circulating medium, and demonstrating to them that their interest, as a class, lies in precisely the opposite direction.

The brief principle on which this rests, is that if the value of money is diminished by depreciation, the working classes may be certain that their wages, in one way or other, will not keep pace with the depreciation, but always be a march behind. So that in addition to what they may lose by the naked circumstance, there is the further mischief of a continual pressure operating to induce them to do without one crumb of comfort and respectability after another, and so to increase the magnitude of the final evil undergone. In the opposite case of a rise in the value of money, there might be a certain tendency for the operatives to gain; but it would be comparatively feeble, and in practice probably next to null. For there is no denying or helping the fact, that the masters have more power of reducing wages in the event of the value of the money rising, than the workmen have of securing compensation in the opposite event. It proceeds from causes which seem insuperable; which is only a reason why the operative classes should be the more careful to give into no delusion upon the subject, and least of all into that delusion which consists in taking the wrong thing for the right.

"The great fraud and fallacy about the issuing of the "rag money" which so many long for, lies in confounding the benefit a man may make by taking from his neighbours, with a gain to the community. It is a very pleasant thing, no doubt, for an individual to be accommodated with a few thousand pounds of such money, and he may exhibit many agreeable and permanent results from the uses he makes of it. But was all this taken from nobody else? Was not the amount taken, either from what ought to have been occupied by the government and put to the public credit in the shape of a diminution of taxes, if the paper is issued for the advantage of private individuals instead of the government;—or else taken from all the holders of the circulating medium in the country, as is the case when the paper, whether issued by private individuals or the government, is not convertible upon demand at all? If one individual, or if several, had got the power of levying a toll upon the high road, and applied it to build houses, or manufactories, or make establishments of any other kind, nobody would think of saying, "See what a way it is to public wealth, to allow men to take a toll on the high road." For it would be plain that what was gained by one, was lost

by somebody else; and that though the house, or the manufactory, might be a more striking and ostensible object than the halfpence in the pockets of the rest of the community before they were taken away, yet one was of the exact value of the other and nothing gained. And least of all would it be possible to persuade the public, that the way to make general wealth was to allow every man to take his toll in turn. Yet this is something closely akin to the fallacy, which tells the public to admire the wonderful advantages produced by banks and paper money.

A community which had sound knowledge on these points, would be extremely likely to be well informed also on the irrecoverable nature of money borrowed and spent, and divided among a nation in the shape of funded property. If the sum borrowed had been spent in gunpowder, and a match put at once to the whole, it would be within most men's comprehension that it was useless to think of recovery. And just as useless is it to think of recovery, if it has been wasted on anything else which is consumed and gone. Nations should be aware of this, when they see their governments what is called getting into debt. If the debt was to the Man in the Moon, there might be such a thing possible as making a national gain by stopping his interest. But when a government is allowed to borrow money on condition of paying the borrowers the interest out of their own pockets, this chance is done away; as would be plain if every man had a share of the interest equal to the taxes he must pay towards it. If men have not shares in this proportion, then it would be possible for those who have less, to take from those who have more. But this is not making a national gain, any more than sending a detachment of men to levy money from passengers on the highways would be; because all that is gained by one must be taken from another. Money spent and laid upon the funds, is therefore, in a national sense, irrecoverable. One great use of knowing which, is that the efforts for national improvement may be directed where something can be the result, and not where it is impossible. The main device and craft of those who would guide the popular movement to the enemy's liking, is to direct it into a corner between stone walls, where nothing of use can come of it.

One other benefit of familiarity with subjects of this kind, would be the escape from all painful anxiety after what troubles some unfortunate persons under the title of paying off the national debt. When nothing can be paid off but by giving the exact value of it in the market, heaven forbid we

should do anything so foolish, as abridge our comforts for the sake of enabling some future government to make unjust wars against our interest. Where there is any necessary connexion between the expenditure of the government and the interests of the people, the power of expenditure may possibly be an advantage. But when there is no stopping delirious expenditure but by being bled into a deliquium, it would be the height of folly to pay a high price for having blood put back again into our veins for the government to go mad upon. There is a confusion upon this point, akin to what exists in the notion of creating national wealth by refusing to pay the interest of a debt. When men talk of paying off a national debt, they lose sight of the fact that there is nobody to pay it off but themselves. If the Man in the Moon would do us this office, it might be voted a good; though the effect would only be to enable the government to fleece us to the same amount again, and lay out the amount to our damage. But when we are to pay it off ourselves, let us hope there is sense in the existing generation, to keep their money in their pockets when they are able.

London, 3 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Nottingham Review.

No. VII.

MR. STANLEY ON AMERICAN MANUFACTURES.—CASE FROM NOTTINGHAM.—THE POWER OF COMPETING CUT OFF BY THE GOVERNMENT.

SIR,—I beg to offer some observations on the letter of Mr. Stanley in your paper of the 20th ult., with the purpose of endeavouring to extend the familiarity with the nature of the facts stated, the causes, and the remedy.

You are informed that goods of the kind your neighbourhood is concerned in, can be got in America from other markets than yours, "cheaper by fifty per cent and much better." This does not tell us accurately, or rather it does not tell us at all, what is the precise difference of cost in America between goods of one origin and of the other, supposed to be equal in point of quality. But it tells us at all events, that the difference is not less than what the writer means by 50

per cent. And there may also be some uncertainty about what is meant by fifty per cent; for men sometimes use it to mean cheaper by half the greater price, and sometimes half the smaller. But to take the lowest of all these possibilities, let the information be understood to convey, that if goods of a certain quality can be got in America from Nottingham for three dollars, they can be got of the same or equal quality from Germany or elsewhere for two.

Now what is the cause of this? Endeavour to strip it of all circumstances that can be detached from it; and begin by fixing attention on the fact, that in any given country, money is merely the instrument by which the exchange of commodities of various kinds is effected, as might be done by setting off bits of paper against one another, and that the things really exchanged are the commodities.

The first thing that presents itself, is that the introduction of foreign food is prevented in England, for the purpose and with the effect of increasing the quantity of all other commodities which shall be given to the owners of land in return for its produce. In other words, a great quantity of commodities of every other kind, must be given for any stated quantity of food, as for instance for the quantity sufficient to the daily support of an average labourer. How far then can the produce of labour employed in manufactures, as for instance of your labour at Nottingham, continue to be exchanged abroad? Just so far as foreign commodities (with the exclusion of food, which is prohibited) can be got in exchange on such terms or in such quantities for a given quantity of your own, as being brought to England shall exchange again for the commodities wanted to be consumed and enjoyed in the shape of wages and profits by all concerned in your manufacture at Nottingham; in which one most prominent necessity is, that there be enough to exchange for the food consumed by the manufacturers employed. Put the case then, that there is a manufactory at Nottingham, and another of the same kind in Germany, and see how they will be situated for rivalling one another. Each in return for a pair of gloves or stockings of similar quality, must get in America, as many American commodities as when brought home will exchange for as many good things as will constitute wages and profits to the concerned, and among other items will replace the food which has been consumed during the process of manufacturing, and give promise of continuing to do so if the manufacture shall be persevered in. And sup-

pose for simplicity, that the Nottingham and German manufacturers require to consume the same quantity and quality of food; or if the German can live on less or worse, let that be set down as so much reason why the manufacture can be carried on in Germany with smaller returns, and consequently longer, than in Nottingham. But the Nottingham manufacturers must bring home a great quantity of cotton (if that be taken to represent the American commodity returned) in order to exchange for the food to be given to their labourers, or which comes to the same thing, which has been given to them already and must be paid for. And this for the reason, that in England a small quantity of corn is made to exchange for a given quantity of every thing else, and consequently a large quantity of anything else must be offered to effect an exchange with a given quantity of corn. The German manufacturer on the other hand, is only obliged to bring home a little quantity of cotton, because in his country the value of food is not artificially raised in comparison of other things, but on the contrary food is abundant, and a great quantity of it may be had in exchange for anything else. Let the fact then be taken to be, that the German can obtain or replace the food of his labourers by the exchange of one pound of cotton, where the Nottingham man can only do it by the exchange of two. It is plain that as far as this most important item in the process of production is concerned, the German may bring home half as much cotton as the Nottinghamer, and do with it just as well. And on adding the other items of the two accounts where the German and the Nottinghamer may have been nearer an equality, this proportion of one to two may on the whole be reduced to some other, as for instance two to three. That is to say, two pounds of cotton will do for the German as well as three will for the Nottinghamer; in other words the German can afford to take as much cotton as can be bought in America for two dollars, while the Nottinghamer must stand out for what can be bought with three; or which comes to the same thing, the German can afford for two dollars, what the Nottinghamer can only afford for three, and consequently the German will drive the Nottinghamer out of the market, and go on trading triumphantly, while the other will be lodged in the *Gazette*.

It is evident the Nottingham manufacturer may have advantages on his side, which shall still be swallowed up by the overwhelming cause which is acting in favour of the German. For instance, the German may have inferior machinery or skill to any imaginable extent, and yet it will be a mere

question of arithmetic how far these shall balance or not, the great superiority he has from the other cause. Without troubling anybody for voluminous accounts on these subjects, we may go at once to the evidence announced by Mr. Stanley, and find the practical fact to be, that in spite of any inferiority of the Germans on these heads, the German goods are selling cheaper than the English by what he intends by fifty per cent.

If it be an evil that the Nottingham trade should be stopped while the German shall go on, the remedy for it can clearly be only one,—to remove the cause, which is the artificially high price of food. To call England a manufacturing or commercial country, is mere insult or blarney, while measures are taken by the government to cut down the power of competing with foreigners, by internal regulations intended for the private benefit of the class that makes the laws.

There appears nothing in this, but what all with pains may understand; and it would be a libel on the allowed intelligence and activity of commercial men, to suppose that anything but inadvertence, or engagement in other directions, can have prevented them from comprehending it. But if the manufacturing capitalists were all familiar with cause and effect in this question, the case would reduce itself to the demonstration, of what would seem to be no hidden truth,—that the interests of the operative classes are bound up with those of the capitalists in obtaining what is technically called the "good trade," which is good for master and for man, and the bad the contrary.

London, 2 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editors of the Sheffield Iris.

No. VIII.

PROGRESS OF THE HOLY ALLIANCE SYSTEM.—PROPOSED HOLY ALLIANCE CONGRESS.

SIRS,—As our boasted constitutional checks have been insufficient, I will not say to *prevent*, but to make the smallest *attempt* to prevent one or two men in power from carrying back our country into all the dirt of the Holy Alliance, from which we thought it had been gradually and slowly

escaping since 1815, there is nothing left for us but to view our position calmly, and wait till Providence opens, if it will open, some method of escape.

It would seem as if all political lessons acted on men only like a temporary *vaccine*,—an influence which is to wear out, and at the best leave the process to be gone through again. Even so early as the Bourbon invasion of Spain in 1823, there was sufficient recovery from the madness of Holy Alliances in England, to oblige the government to draw off, and preserve at least a colourable neutrality. Now, the grant made to ministers of complete impunity by the sale and bargain executed by the class denominating themselves "good reformers," has carried us back to a depth unknown to former times. England is now in the forefront of the battle, for that smothering of political change by the arms of united despots, which Wellington and Castlereagh at the pinnacle of their success were afraid to avow. The "good reformers" have done this; and they are as busy as ever in confirmation of their deed.

A year ago it would have been held time thrown away, to try to demonstrate to the English public the danger of these unions of despotic powers, and the weighty interests England had in being considered the disperser rather than the cementer of such Alliances. One crow out of the Tory nest, has been sufficient to drive the imbecillity and half-heartedness of a Whig ministry into the closest union with the abhorred thing.

There has been no hesitation, no moderation, no fear. Parliament went to sleep under a Liberal government, and wakes in the arms of the Holy Alliance. The imbeciles that would "keep the Tories out," have now got the Tories in, to the fulfilment of the dearest wish the Tories could devise, which was to have the power without the responsibility. The Tories guide us into the haven of their desires, while their dupes maintain the cuckoo cry to "keep them out." We are the slaves, not of a splendid or polished, but of an ill-mannered and coarse absolutism. Pains would seem to have been taken, to exhibit to us in glaring colours the interest which all wise men have in repressing and preventing these conjunctions of the enemies of human improvement. At this very moment, dull, leaden Austria puts herself forward to prevent all pacification, by throwing terms she thinks will be inadmissible into the scale; and the uncontrolled and uncontrollable power the treachery of self-called Reformers has established here, is found willingly yoking itself to the same train. The in-

solence of individual dictators is fearful and intolerable; but the insolence of despotic Alliances is something sublimed and elevated in comparison. Fancy, for instance, a Holy Alliance triumphant in the British Channel, and sending to the English supposed to be reduced to a willingness to negotiate, not a demand to accede to certain terms reasonable or unreasonable, but a demand through their own officer, that the English shall send and make submission to some puppet power whose cause is pretended to be taken up, as the condition of the Allies interceding for forgiveness. This is a kind of brutality from which all men, Christian or Mohammedan, are tempted to revolt. It is insult to the Englishman who sees his country involved in such dark disgrace; but in what way must it be felt by that other sensitive and powerful nation, whose interests on the opposite side were as substantial as those of our absolutes, and vastly more accordant with our own. The determination is evidently to make France sound the lowest string of humility. Only yesterday, the whisper appears of a plan to organize a Congress of the Holy Alliance in London, *Paris*, or Vienna, for the purpose of enforcing universal submission to its decrees, under the well-remembered pretext in 1815 and 1816, of preventing any European wars. How the Congress was to get to Paris, did not so readily appear. But to-day's whisper supplies the want. When the business in the East is done, France is once more to be "pushed by the North against the South," and Louis Philippe, nothing loth, is to direct the French army to put down the Constitutionalists in Spain. If France should oppose, what then? Of course, attack from the Allied Powers to put down war. A ministerial paper of last night, one that is quite angry if refused the name of Radical, is pleased to the top of its bent, by what it declares promises a "mighty step in the way of promoting human happiness;" being this same Congress at "London, or Paris, or Vienna." The purport is clear enough. The powers that shrank from attacking France in 1830, have rallied since, and aided by the imbecillity of the "good reformers" and the treachery of what is called the Lichfield-House compact, are in full march, first on Mohammed Ali, then on the France of 1830, and lastly upon that partial Revolution which followed in England under the title of Reform.

All this has advanced hitherto without even the semblance of opposition from popular control. The position held by England in the world of politics, was nothing but what the breath of a minister was sufficient to blow away. Such is the

security that Englishmen pride themselves upon, while in reality their resources and the fruits of their industry are at the mercy of any ruler who can outlast the session, and plunge into the luxuries of the recess.

London, 27 Nov. 1840.

To the Editor of the Suffolk Chronicle.

No. VIII.

LETTER OF A "FREE-TRADE FARMER."—CASE OF A FARMER INVITED TO PAY DOUBLE PRICES TO HIS BLACKSMITH.—ESTIMATE OF GAINS AND LOSSES.

SIR,—The Letter of a FREE-TRADE FARMER in your paper of the 28th of November, contains a confirmation of a fact on which there has been some dispute, and to which my own attention has from accidental circumstances been directed lately,—namely, that less money is got by the farmers for a universally plentiful harvest than for a bad one; though there can at the same time be no doubt that if the farmers by any means or accident could keep their crops always to the same abundance, the end would be that, through the increase of population consequent on the increase of food, they would sell the increased quantity at the old rate, and *vice versâ*. So that it would be no ultimate interest of the farmers, even if they could all act as one man, permanently to restrict the quantity of food produced, or oppose improvement in the modes of production, but the contrary.

And the proof I now note of this fact being correctly stated, lies in the certainty of its being implied in the evidence referred to as produced by the agriculturists themselves before the Agricultural Distress Committee of the House of Commons in 1836. For without this, an abundant year or years could not produce disappointment to the farmers, or inability to discharge their money engagements entered into on speculation, but the contrary. They speculated on the production of 1000 quarters of corn from a given quantity of land, and they say they were presented with 1200 instead, and the consequence is they cannot pay their rents. There seems no way of making this hold together, but admitting that the actual 1200 quarters sell for less money than the expected 1000 would have done.

This, if all right, is an instance of the way in which one

truth hangs upon another, and one truth throws light upon another.

It is clear enough, that in the cases described by your correspondent, assuming that there is no dispute upon the facts, the Corn Laws were a snare to the farmer, and led him into mischief which he would otherwise have escaped. And they are just as likely to do the same again. So that on the whole the farmer has a claim to place them among his grievances, to the extent at least of the effect they have in making his calling more hazardous and insecure. They are like gales of wind to fishing-boats; which though there may be no denying they carry somebody on the way that he would go, yet cause an average of damage on the whole, sufficient to make the fishermen inclined to give a willing assent to being without them.

I still however feel disposed to hold to the belief (in which I am glad of the degree of concurrence conveyed in the letter of your correspondent) that the share the farmer has through his family in the general sufferings of the country, is the crowning evil which decidedly turns the balance in his disfavour. On the other points of his case, it is possible to plead that he may have good luck as well as bad, or that the evils are traceable to his own inability to take care of himself. But this other mischief is one inseparable, and which no human prudence can escape or modify.

As your correspondent has manifestly his eyes open to the efforts making to induce his class of capitalists to combine in destroying other people's interests and their own, will he allow me to direct his attention, as to matter which he would be eminently serviceable by endeavouring to diffuse, to the radical principle of the benefits of free trade and the evils of the contrary, which is at the bottom of the whole dispute, and of which the question of the Corn Laws is only the application to a particular branch?

The whole debate turns on this. What is gained or lost, by an individual's purchasing or procuring an article at the dearest market instead of the cheapest; and what by a nation's? Are the results of the same nature; and if they are, are they good or bad?

Suppose then, a farmer was invited to have his blacksmith's work done by a bungling blacksmith, when there was another who would do as much and as good work for one shilling, as the first for two. Will the farmer consent to this, or will he admit that there would be any general or national advantage in forcing him and his brother farmers to do the like? It is true it might be pleaded, that this, if bad for a farmer, is good for a

blacksmith; and so far, it might be stated there was a balance. But is this all; and is there nobody else that would have an interest in complaining? If the farmer is made to expend as much more than was necessary upon blacksmiths, the complaint on his part will be, that he is made to expend so much less upon somebody else, from whom he would have got value in return. For instance, he will say, "My bill for blacksmith's work has been made twenty pounds where it need only have been ten, and the consequence is I have been obliged to go without a new cart. Nobody can pay twice over to his blacksmith, and buy carts too." And if he gets into conversation with the village carpenter and wheelwright, and tells him how he had reckoned on ordering one of his best carts, but is prevented by finding the money gone to the high-charging blacksmith instead, will or will not the carpenter discover that he too is an injured man by the process? Will he or will he not grumble and say, "It is a very hard thing, that the squire or the clergyman or whoever it is, could not let you employ what blacksmith you liked best, and so let you have a cart, and me the custom of making it. What good can it do to anybody in the long run? If this blacksmith spends the money with the squire's old butler that keeps the public-house, or his footman that has turned baker at the town's end, should not I have done the same, or something quite as good for somebody? It might have been, that I should have gone for the same pint of ale or the same loaf; so that I cannot see what good there could be to trade, in the blacksmith getting your custom instead of me. And, so sure as I am alive, there would have been one great difference; which is that you would have had a cart."

Now in this there distinctly starts up a second complainant, who says he is damaged to the exact amount of the blacksmith's extraordinary gains. Say that the carpenter would not have got it all, but only the profits that would have stuck with him; and exactly the same will be true of the blacksmith. Carpenter or blacksmith, part sticks with them in the shape of profits, and the rest goes in the shape of profits or wages to somebody else, who are as good in one case as in the other.

Here then are two people, the blacksmith and the carpenter, whose gain and loss in the ten pounds which is the difference concerned (that is, the gain of one and the loss of the other) are exactly of the same kind and nature in every respect, and so are the gains and losses of the tail which each may have behind him. The two therefore may be set off against each other; and you the farmer who have been made to pay ten

extra pounds for nothing to a bad blacksmith, stand out as experimental evidence of what is the final balance of the process. Is there anybody that could convince you, of any reason why you should consent? Would you allow yourself to be persuaded, that there was any patriotism or other virtue concerned in your giving way? If the editor of the *Farmers' Journal*, for instance, should address you on the importance of encouraging the native industry of blacksmiths, would not you tell him it was all a mistake and a blunder, founded on concealment of the fact that there was *another man in the parish* who was injured as well as you; and though it might or might not be reasonable that ten pounds should be taken from a farmer to be given to a blacksmith, it certainly could nót be reasonable that ten pounds should be taken from a farmer and a carpenter too?

And what is there wonderful or strange in this; and would not the wonder be all if the result was anything else? If you a farmer were to employ a clumsy or awkward tool instead of a better, you have the perfect conviction that you would of necessity lose and throw away the value of the difference of the proceeds. How then should it be otherwise, when instead of employing the awkward tool yourself, you employ it in the hands of another man? If you employ a blunt spade, or employ a bungling blacksmith who cannot make and sharpen a spade without making you an extra charge for the performance, is it wonderful that it should come to the same thing? Set it down then, that wherever the community consents to go to a bungling or dear shop when it might go to a better and cheaper, the losses to one person and another in consequence, are double of the gains to the bungling and dear shopkeeper; which is the same thing as saying there is a loss upon the whole account, of exactly the same nature as the loss of an individual who should be tempted to use with his own hands a blunt or bungling tool, when he might have used a better.

This being the result of any one monopoly, the proposal of the *Farmers' Journal* is to mend the matter by giving everybody a monopoly in turn. For this is what it means by inviting "the Home Trade, the Colonial Trade, and the Shipping interest," to take a share of its protection. Consent to pay a blacksmith for working with a bungling tool and making an extra charge in consequence, and you the carpenter shall be indulged with the like liberty, and the farmer too; and so the matter shall be mended to you all. In other words, let everybody rob everybody, with a loss at each time to the

amount of what is thrown away by the use of the bungling instruments, and everybody will find themselves the better in the end. The upshot of this, is clearly to invite the whole community to put themselves to the loss of using bad tools everywhere instead of good. And it stands out a miraculous instance of what the aristocratic notions of commerce are.

London, 2 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the True Scotsman.

No. VII.

LOOSE FAMILIARITIES.—IT IS THE FIRST STEP THAT COSTS.—CONSEQUENCES OF ALLOWING IT.

SIR,—It would be ill discharging the duties of a correspondent whom you honour with a marked position in your paper, if I did not use the opportunity to warn of coming danger, to the extent of the judgment it may be in my power to exert. It is better the sentry should warn twice and be wrong, than let mischief arrive once for want of notice.

I cannot help believing Castlereagh times are before us; and for this reason, that we have got back by a skip and a jump to the Holy Alliance union of the Castlereagh day. Do you think that when your ministers are hand and glove with Austria, Russia, and Prussia, to put down the progress of civilization in one place and check it in another, you are not to come in for your share of the discipline, and the foreigners' knout is not to be borrowed for your backs if you give temptation and opportunity?

You see the ministry have thrown off the pretences they began with, that they were making a little war to prevent a great one; and avow distinctly that they are conducting the war now, to pleasure Austria by honouring legitimacy in the person of the Grand Turk, and at the same time leaving the least chance for any peaceful conclusion. Thus it always is. All men who have arrived at the age of forty, are acquainted with the thing. They know as well when they see a government taking these courses, what the end of them is to be, as a sagacious matron knows the end of loose familiarities of her juniors with their male acquaintances. But that does not make the world either wiser or better conducted; girls come on the parish, and nations like England and France are

deluded out of their liberties, their safety, and their interest, just as if nobody had ever heard of the process before, or of its consequences.

The truth is, that all liberty is a thing gained with pains, and not kept a minute after it ceases to be looked to. Liberty is the power of doing something it would be somebody else's interest you should not; and therefore, if *you* are not upon the watch, somebody else is. The best of ministers might say, "Trust none of us;" and the worst can only say, they will take no more than they can get. The fault was not in ministers, but those who let them. If a minister is tempted on, by one permission and familiarity after another, it is impossible to expect him to be of such cold blood as not to seize the opportunity presented. The best and quietest of governors probably makes the trial some time or other, whether he will be permitted further than strict propriety would allow; and according to the rebuff which he gets or does not, is his behaviour afterwards.

The ministers have much to say in their defence. The temptation was perhaps greater than men can bear. The first distinct impropriety attempted with the constitution, was in the affair of Canada. They soon found there was to be no resistance. Two or three, of whom I might be one, were disposed to summon aid, and as heroines of novels do on like occasions, attempted to "ring the bell violently." But it was of no use; the footman would not come; nay, some of his brotherhood were actually rejoicing, that though the thing was unjust, the people had been beaten by the grenadiers. And so the grenadiers had their will; and it was plain there was nothing to do, but do the like again. The guardians, or those that should have been, were bought; not actually with money, but with some kind of turtle or venison it was their hearts' imagination to enjoy. And as it is the first step that costs, there was no want of more to follow. China, India, were successively tried, and it was evident there was to be no effectual opposition. In truth, in one way or other, the greatest part of those from whom earnest opposition was to have been expected, had been wrought out of parliament; in some cases by the immediate interference of the parties who take upon themselves the title of public watchmen. The resistance of those parties themselves was colourable and unreal. The conversation in Addison's *Spectator*, represented as overheard between two prize-fighters, where one is asked if he will give cuts or receive, and offers to receive, which the other agrees to on the assurance that his adversary is not a passionate man,—

is a specimen of the sort of understanding that existed. There was to be no slashing; the depth of any scratches was compounded for, and there was a special compact that no ill blood was to be the consequence. In this mode was the Canadian treason of ministers to be resisted in parliament; and in this mode it was resisted accordingly. There was to be no perilous appeal to popular opinion; no dangerous rousing of apprehensions of the like to others. And so the way was cleared for whatever came after.

And as mischief moves quick, it was not long before the ministry was led to its great attempt, the trial whether the public would go back to the Holy Alliance of 1815, and then to the war of 1793. It knew the people it had to deal with, and made no mistake. So here we are, after all the discourses of "good reformers" in house and field, landed by the same "good reformers" in the position our fathers held in the choice days of George the Third. There will not three dozen of them turn a feather; and those who do, will only do it because they know no consequence will come of it.

In these circumstances, is it wise or is it not, that reformers should prepare for a coming storm? The engine that will be used against us, will be the law; which is a craftily prepared machine, kept up from government to government, for the chance of using when the time comes;—an armoury of "cruel pieces of torment," as the warder at the Tower calls the thumb-screws pretended to have been found in the Spanish Armada, but more likely to have been those tried upon President Carstairs under the legitimate James the Second.

After this general warning, another time I will try to go into more detail.

London, 1 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Bolton Free Press.

No. X.

WHAT SHOULD WE GAIN BY CALLING A SIXPENCE A SHILLING?—THE "CORN AND CURRENCY" FALLACY.

SIR,—The letter of Mr. Muntz which is taken as the subject of our exercise, proceeds to say:—

'I am charged with proposing that all creditors, public and private, shall be robbed of half their debts. I never proposed any such thing.

If the writer had understood anything of the subject, he would have known, that if a man receive his rental, or interest, or wages, in a depreciated coin, with the power of paying that coin away at the same value at which he receives it, he can lose nothing; unless the articles he consumes advance in price in consequence of the depreciation.'

This wants explanation; which probably the author could supply in a small compass. But for want of it, there is nothing to be done but state what are the possible facts and their consequences, and then guess at what has been intended.

If coins are depreciated, as for instance till shillings have only the power of purchasing which sixpences had before, and in consequence a man receives a double number of shillings for a given quantity of goods he sells in the market, and pays them away at the same rate of two for one for goods he wants to buy, he evidently can lose nothing. Was this what was intended by the paragraph quoted?

If a man receive his rental, interest, or wages, in a depreciated coin, and *receive only the same number of coins he would have expected before the depreciation* (which is what the words rental, interest, wages, seem intended to imply); to say that this man can lose nothing unless the articles he consumes advance in price in consequence of the depreciation, is saying he can lose nothing unless the depreciation *is* a depreciation. He may be paid in a depreciated coin and lose nothing,—upon this condition only, that the depreciated coin is not a depreciated coin, and the depreciation is no depreciation. For depreciation means that the coins buy less, or which is the same thing, that other articles advance in price in respect of them; and how a man is to be paid in the same number of coins that buy less and not lose by it, is unintelligible, and in fact a contradiction in terms.

But as intimated before, it is very likely that this only wants some touch of explanation to be understood. For instance, the writer is found saying at some distance afterwards, "The assumed loss by private creditors is a ghost raised to frighten silly people. As before remarked, those who received depreciated money would pay it away in the same manner." In which he would appear to allude to the class of creditors who receive two shillings for one, and pay them away at the same rate; for it is visibly untrue of any others. If this was what was meant to be said here, it would to all appearance be right; only it does not seem to have been said, or not distinctly. That in respect of what may be termed "private creditors," and debtors too,—meaning such traders as hold

both debts and credits in pretty equal amount, and of no very long standing to cause much loss or gain on any balance there may be,—in respect, in other words, of the day-to-day or week-to-week transactions in the market,—any imaginable changes in the value of money, either in the way of depreciation or the contrary, flow harmless, and as nearly as possible insensible, so long as they are tolerably gradual and without breaks-down or violent concussion;—is a great truth to know, and one that tells equally on both sides of a currency question. That there will always be a tendency, under a gradual depreciation, for the wages of labour to be a day's march behind, is an evil peculiar to the working classes, and perhaps not meant to be included in the term "creditors" employed. And there are still behind, the gains or losses of those who may be connected with the act of issue.

'What we have, therefore, to consider is, whether the present prices of property, produce, and wages, are most in accordance with the present standard of 3*l.* 17*s.* 10½*d.* per ounce of gold, which is at the rate of silver at 5*s.* per ounce and wheat at 5*s.* per bushel, or with an altered standard at the rate of silver at 7*s.* 6*d.* per ounce and wheat at 7*s.* 6*d.* per bushel.'

Supposing it settled then, that the rise or fall of money is indifferent in the main to the every-day transactions of two-sided traders in the market, what is the meaning of present prices being "*more in accordance*" with one value of an ounce of silver and a bushel of wheat, than with another;—with 7*s.* 6*d.* than with 5*s.*;—in other words, with the number of bank notes being such, as to make the Pound Note buy only 2¾ ounces of silver or bushels of wheat, instead of 4? The author seems to have admitted, that to the transactions of trade in the main, it is indifferent *which* it is. Why then does he not state distinctly, that he desires the bank notes to be multiplied till the pound note buys only 2¾ of any given thing instead of 4, for the sake of the effects to be produced on those to whom it is *not* indifferent, to wit the holders of old and perpetually-recurring *one-sided* contracts, who may be represented by the mortgagees on one hand, and the mortgagers on the other? For this, and this only, would have brought the contest to a reasonable statement.

But, taking the question upon this ground, it does not appear that the author proceeds to enter upon any reasons. Having admitted that the mere rate of money is indifferent to trade (with the exception of the classes intimated), he appears immediately to forget it, and assume that a difference in the rate of prices is to be counted as loss.

'Supposing the article of *wheat* alone to cost about sixty millions per annum, by reducing the price to the standard of 5*s.* there would be a reduction of twenty millions *per annum*, which would absorb all rent at least; without counting the ruin of tenants and reduction of agricultural labour, which would be even greater than the reduction in the price of the necessaries of life. But the loss of these twenty millions is considered as nothing by the *holy league* that conduct the *sacred* cause;—'

Now surely the holy league know better than to admit that there would be any loss at all; except the losses to some, and gains to others, which might arise during the process of adapting rents and leases to new rates of money. Has not the author himself shown that he understood the only effect on the growers of wheat and those immediately concerned, to be that the wheat trade would be conducted by the passage and circulation of forty millions of dirty bits of paper, appearing over and over like the armies made out of twenty men in a tragedy, instead of sixty millions? Who might have to pay for the buying up the notes in circulation, so as to reduce them to two-thirds,—or who in the opposite case might gain by what was got for the additional issues,—is another distinct affair, and to be examined into when the time comes. But here it seems scarcely deniable, that the author has confounded the difference in nominal values, with a substantial loss or gain to the same total amount; and this after having, so far as can be collected, begun by perceiving that there was no necessary connexion between the things at all. Or if he has not done this, he appears at all events to have hazarded the assertion of this twenty millions loss, without having hitherto furnished any demonstration to support it.

London, 10 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Dundee Chronicle.

No. III.

WHIG NON-INTERFERENCE, IS INTERFERENCE AGAINST THE PEOPLE'S SIDE.—CAUTION TO FRIENDS OF POLITICAL IMPROVEMENT.

SIR,—On looking over the first number under your new direction, I am glad to see the first column referring to those abuses of power and of national faith by the Whigs, which have put them in the position of enemies to the lovers of civilization and political improvement. And I bring the

subject to notice now, in confirmation of the warnings conveyed on previous opportunities, of the certainty that the extremes of hostility to all popular reformers may be looked for at their hands.

The passages you have quoted show the non-interference professed by the Whigs to be a mere fraud, put forward for the purpose of delusion when it suits their ends, and broken through when any object is to be gained. But, after all, let it be borne in mind that the great charge against them is, not that they interfere, but that they interfere *against the just cause;*—against the cause to which they were pledged by all their professions, and all the promises on the faith of which they were raised to power by the people;—that they interfere, in short, *against the people's side*, and thereby constitute themselves the people's enemies.

Their attack on the Egyptians, with all the infamy of what they call their "glorious successes," but what you and I believe to be disgraces both to orderers and actors which in the opinions of honest men can never be wiped off, is nothing but the outbreak of lordly and aristocratic insolence against a people and a leader, who were seen taking their way, in such manner as their circumstances admitted and pointed out, towards civilization and improvement. They had not done everything—as how should they?—which three Whig Commissioners might have recommended, as the road to public happiness; but they had begun,—the leader by directing, and the people by assenting,—to put down the grossest evils of the state in which they found themselves at starting. They had made their country safe, and subject to some law, if not to the best of Whig Commissioners' law. A man who is a little grocer's son to begin with, does not put himself at the top of a country, but because somebody is willing to help him. We see men enough who stick at the top of things because they were born there, without anybody's will at all; and these are precisely the men whose hatred to the class who raise themselves by the assistance of their fellows, is most bitter and complete.

The progress made by Egypt under the government of this grocer's son, gave high umbrage to the English aristocracy which held the office of mismanaging the British affairs at Constantinople. The phrase attributed to the individual primarily responsible in that quarter, is the very gross one of saying, "he had only to spit upon the governor of Egypt, to smother him." So would aristocrats spit on you and me and everything belonging to us, if we had not, or did not keep

up, the means to hinder them. And to carry out the principle conveyed in this phrase it is, that the force provided at your expense and mine for honest defence, is employed in wholesale murder of the unfortunate men who have aspired like ourselves to political improvement, and our own money used to destroy our own friends, and set our enemies on horseback to trample on ourselves.

Is it likely these enemies will not use their power to the utmost, to show they can spit on you and all who set themselves in serious opposition to their treason to the public cause? A fictitious opposition they will tolerate; in fact it is one of their great interests to encourage it. They will encourage everything, that will end in nothing. But where they see a real determination to call the public attention to their misdeeds and lay the axe to the root, there they will be desperate and reckless. They are engaged in wrong much too far for going back. They have thrown off the mask abroad, and cannot longer wear it at home. We are sunk into that worst of dangers,—against which warning was of no use,—which every man was to be hooted down, as I was to be by the hirelings of the Whig-Radicals in Marylebone, who dreamed of resisting,—the union of the two strong parties in the state for the destruction of the popular cause. The joy of the Tories is open and unconcealed. They boast in their high places, that if they had been in office, all this could never have been done;—that nothing but allowing their rivals to keep office, and work themselves down in public estimation till they were reduced to be beggars upon Tory help and counsel, could have brought their own principles into the exaltation they now have reached.

Caution, then, to all real friends of political improvement, should be the order of the day. The standard raised against our friends and old allies abroad, will soon be upon us at home. It is in the nature of military machines, that with the same pleasure as they regard the mangled limbs of men who never hurt them, but were the friends of them and theirs, they would regard yours if they were bidden to the work. Indeed this training, and the breaking down of all reluctancies in favour of what may be called the liberal cause, were among the leading temptations to the present crimes.

Once more then, caution, and redoubled zeal towards obtaining those means of constitutional power, by which alone there is a prospect that the past can be reckoned for, and the future made any better.

London, 7 Dec. 1830.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXXVIII.

THE LAW RELATING TO POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS.—MR. O'CONNELL'S LETTER TO MR. HAMER STANSFELD*.—ALLEGED "NATIONAL HOSTILITY OF THE ENGLISH TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND."

SIR,—Finding you roundly state as an objection to the "Convention Scheme," that it is "decidedly illegal," you will perhaps not dislike to receive a statement of what may and may not be done according to the existing laws; drawn up by one of the oldest and best-informed friends of the people, who may be considered as having been personally engaged in the struggle against superior force since 1792. It has the further advantage of not having been drawn up with reference to the "scheme" now proposed to our Yorkshiremen; being in fact of much older date. As in these days every man must be his own lawyer, and nobody will go to Norfolk Island instead of him if he falls into the claws of the enemy, it behoves every man to think twice upon what he is asked to do.

'LAW RELATING TO POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS.

'The Tories, during their half century of misrule, have heaped statute upon statute to prevent associations of the people. The acts which apply to Political Unions are the 39th Geo. III. c. 79, and the 57th Geo. III. c. 19. It will be seen by the following statement, that Tory malevolence and Tory lawyer-craft have been unable to prevent the formation of political associations at the present crisis.

'The act of 39 Geo. III. *prohibited all sorts of correspondence and intercourse between societies whose proceedings were secret; and it also prohibited the appointment of delegates or other officers in all such societies; and it further declared that every such society was an illegal combination and confederacy, and that every member of such society, and every person not a member who held intercourse* with such society, was amenable to the punishments mentioned in the act, viz., *fine and imprisonment* on information before one justice of the peace, or on conviction by indictment *transportation for seven years.*

'*It did the same in respect to every political society which had any divisions or branches.*

'It did not prohibit societies which had no secret proceedings, divisions or branches, from holding correspondence with other such societies.

'It did not prohibit the appointment of delegates in such societies, nor meetings of such delegates.

'It was therefore lawful for any society which had no secret proceedings, to correspond in any way it pleased with other societies; and to appoint delegates to meet and transact business with the delegates of other such societies.

'But during the administration of Lord Castlereagh, the liberties of

* Dated Darrynane Abbey, 16 Nov. 1840. Is in the *Leeds Times* of 28 Nov. 1840.

the people, which had been very much abridged during the administration of Mr. Pitt, were thought to be still too great, and it was concluded that the more the intelligence and consequent good conduct of the people increased, the greater was the necessity to destroy their "rights and liberties," and *an act was therefore passed with this intention, subjecting all political societies to the penalties of the act of 39th Geo. III.*

'*No political society can therefore hold correspondence or intercourse with any other such society, nor appoint delegates to confer with one another on any matter relating to the society, &c. &c.*

'These acts, disgraceful as they are to the legislature and to the nation, do not however prohibit any Union from recommending the establishment of other Unions. They do not prohibit any Union from sending instructions to any body of persons for the formation of other Unions.

'They do not prohibit any Union from appointing delegates to meet persons desirous of forming Unions, and assisting to conduct their proceedings *to the moment the Union is formed*, but all such interference must cease before such Union is declared to be in existence.

'They do not prohibit any one from being a member of as many Unions as he pleases.

'They do not prohibit any one from being a member of the councils of as many Unions as he pleases.

'They do not prohibit any one from saying in any Union, or in the council of any Union, anything he pleases, as a member of the council or Union he is addressing, provided he is not, and does not take upon himself the character of, a delegate.

'Thus every man may see, what he may and what he may not do under these new-fangled laws, which his father or grandfather would have declared the people of Great Britain never would submit to.'

The punishments specified by these laws for infractions of the same, are arbitrary, within the limits of fine and imprisonment one way, and transportation for seven years the other. There is probably at this moment not a man who has ever given any attention to politics on the popular side, who has not been over and over in the power of the government to be transported for seven years. For my own part, I recollect well the odd sensation, of finding that I had been in the habit of committing transportable offences at the rate of two a-day; my crimes, on being searched into, consisting in having held communion with Mr. Owen at a time when he was in some state of legal impurity. It is the same thing towards the gratification of the arbitrary principle in a governor, whether he has the power to say as he pleases "Transport me that man," and "Imprison me that other,"—or whether he can reduce the population at large to such a state, that he has only to pick his men and proceed against them by process of law for that purpose provided. There is no use in a government's

going to the trouble of declaring itself arbitrary; it comes to the same thing if it can felonize the population. We are all permitted felons as the case stands; and the executive at any time has only to pick and pounce, as the lord of a poultry-yard may direct this turkey to appear to-morrow, in links of sausages, and those minor fowls to congregate within the prison of a pie.

Now what is the use of a counsellor that tells us to run directly where the enemy would wish? Either the popular party are to work some grief to their enemies, or they are not. If they work none, they may be contemptuously let alone; but if they produce any of the effect intended, they are to be ready placed in the circumstances, which shall enable the enemy to crush them with the vast applause of his half of the world. The counsellor would never have come to harm. With the zeal which Cobbett ascribed to dissenters, for making all men with hanging propensities belong to the established church,—it would have been *evasit, erupit*, long before the mischief came to head. But the poor Pillgarlicks who had followed him, would have been left to eat emu when they could get it, under the "superintendent of Canadian prisoners" or some similar functionary, and with as little commiseration from "the gem of the sea."

There is no use in criticizing in detail the contents of what must have been meant for a friendly letter. But we are preached to on the whole, in a way that might have been spared. The same mistake seems to have been made, as by the Frenchmen who received the Attwood deputation (let it have been better or worse) at Paris. The deputation came to intimate, that there were at all events some Englishmen who took the French view of the subject in dispute. And instead of civilly expressing their satisfaction at such information, the Frenchmen scolded them heartily for all the short-comings *of the hostile side*. So here, there was small need to tell us that some masters are venal, and some of the "slave-class" servile,—that the fanatics are fanatical, and the bigots are bigoted,—and that some thousands who are paid for it, encourage and propagate a hatred to the religion of everybody else. All these were just the things we knew ourselves. But there is one thing we did not know, and the announcement of which is stoutly to be resisted,—and that is, the national hostility of the English to the people of Ireland. It would be just as reasonable to talk of the national hostility of the English to the population of the West Indies. It was nothing but the strong sentiment of the universal English people against the oppressors and the tyrants, that ever loosed the bars of either

tyranny at all. And their recompense was, to be threatened with 300,000 Irishmen the first time there came the appearance of a feud with the existing powers that made an opening for it. Wait till some English popular leader has asked for 300,000 Englishmen to put down the first Irishmen that take a wrong course in a tithe campaign, before a word be listened to about "the national hostility of the English to the people of Ireland."

London, 10 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leicestershire Mercury.

No. VIII.

EXTENSION OF CHARTERISM UPWARDS.—THE REFORM BILL AN INTENDED FRAUD.

SIR,—Your leading article of last week points to a fact, which is found confirmed in other quarters,—that Charterism is extending upwards. Meaning always by Charterism, an attachment to the great principles of popular government which were embodied in what was called "the People's Charter."

Names are easily brought into disrepute; but names are not for that reason to be given up, at all events till others are provided as good. It is not easy to assign any other name, that says so distinctly what the originators wanted.

It would be foolish therefore to abandon the title, because some individuals who had no more right to apply it to purposes apart from the original intent than anybody else, chose to embark in useless attempts to carry their ends by force, or ran their heads into a corner with a determination to have nothing short of what they chose to fix on, and to wait till they got it. The original combination for the Charter, was an assemblage of men not without intelligence, weight, and some positive influence in the shape of power in hand, under even the cunningly-framed system for bad government, which their object was to mend. But new leaders stood up and took possession of the machine; and guided it and themselves, into the position they now occupy.

But there is no necessity for the matter being left where it is. It is no new thing for a good cause to have been damaged to the extent of what malevolent fate seemed able to invent. We were not born with silver spoons in our mouths, nor have learned to consider a cause the wrong one, because it found no favour with the powers that be. If the Charter was good

for anything before anybody made it a pretext for folly, it is capable of being as good as ever. The single question is, do the industrious and influential classes in the country need the provisions of the Charter, and would they be the better for them? Or will they be the better for continuing as they are?

It has been demonstrated over and over by this time, that, as you say, the Reform Bill was a failure. It was such a failure as men generally contrive to make, when a thing was never intended to be anything else. The very first parliament which had to be elected after the change, was elected under a fraud, which if the nation had a voice and sense to use one, would have induced a demand for a new parliament at once. The Whig ministers, with what in a concern of private life would have been called the falsehood by reservation, bottled up their belief "that a preponderance of the agricultural interest tended to the stability of the institutions of the country," till the elections were over. They went to a general election under false colours, and when they had got their parliament, which they keep to this day, they let out the truth which they had laboriously withheld. There was no help for this, as there is no help for any other description of kick which a ministry may chuse to locate on a nation's forbearance. But it was an abiding evidence that the Reform Bill was not only a failure, but an intended fraud; there was the visible fact, that under cover of the provisions made by the constitution for the creation and contrivance of evil, the government had slipped back into the predominance of the former despotisms, the moment they could get the felons' lease of seven years license before them.

The Reform Bill then being not only a failure but a fraud, it seems inevitable that for the same reason that there was a discontent before, there should be a discontent again. The enjoyment of place and patronage, divided and subdivided among the remotest branches of pretended reformers, must after all be incapable of satisfying anything like the general appetite of the multitudes concerned. The "good reformers" may have made their market; but they have made the market of nobody else. The national demand for the bread of life, must be as strong, or nearly so, as ever.

In aid of all other discoveries of the fraudulent nature of the pretended Reform, has in these latter days come the grand movement into the ranks of the Holy Alliance. How much further the popular cause may or can sink, it is not easy to predict; but unless the power of reaction in the mind of man is extinct, we wait only for some exciting cause, to set the

pendulum in motion the other way, with force proportioned to its movement in the opposite. Home politics have always a certain leaning upon foreign; there is no instance of a nation engaged in doing the work of despots abroad, which was promoting its own liberties at home. There is an inward shame and consciousness of national dishonour, which bow down the minds of men and disincline them from chusing that period for efforts in their own behalf. On the other hand, the feeling of being engaged in honest and honourable efforts abroad, sharpens the appetite for improvement at home. No nation flourishes under leaders it considers as disgraceful; even the slave slackens his obedience, and becomes a machine less powerful for ill.

Whenever the effort for Reform is revived, will it be too much to hope that the experience of the past will be a lantern to men's paths? Shall we not value ourselves on some knowledge of the symptoms, which indicate coming betrayal, and an approaching going over of our leaders to the enemy? The soundest of all conclusions, is that he who refuses to go on, means to turn back. There is no such finality in human affairs, as to allow any political sect to say, here will we stop, and progress be no more. It may be a necessity of man's nature, to learn by disappointment; but let it be hoped that the extent of the lesson acquired, will bear some proportion to the magnitude of the evil undergone.

London, 9 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Manchester Advertiser.

No. X.

Traps which the Tories laid, and the Whigs are ready to play off.

Sir,—As the Tories' half-century of misrule is likely to be followed by as much more at the hands of such as only differ from them in name and in being unopposed, I know no better service that can be attempted to the popular party which still lingers in existence, than calling to their notice the various traps and snares which the Tories laid for them, and the Whigs are in readiness to play off against them when the time shall come.

In every direction it has been proved and established, that in proportion to their opportunities of display, the finger of

the Whigs has been heavier than the loins of their predecessors. The Tories fought without regard to the laws of God or man, in a cause which they avowed and boasted of till they almost persuaded themselves it sanctified the evil. The Whigs do the same, but in a cause which they always disavowed and affected to rebuke. The Tories might be given up to a reprobate mind; but the Whigs are the sinners against light and knowledge, for whom it were better that a millstone had been tied about their necks and they had been thrown into the sea. The world is old enough to know that there is no use in asking heaven for judgments; but still there have occasionally been symptoms of a connexion between guilt and punishment, which cherish the hope of some such dispensation here.

On the particular item of cruelty, it is clear too, that the Whigs are not behind in the steam-engine improvements which might be expected from their age. In every quarter of the globe they have displayed the wolfish character that belongs to them. A bloody race they were, from their beginning hitherto. The man is a fool, who allows himself to be invited within reach of their tender mercies, or trusts his limbs and person to the flatteries of their softest paw.

At this moment it is probable there is not one man in twenty of any activity or eminence on the popular side, whom the Whigs could not seize and send to keep company with the Canadian patriots in New Holland. There is not the smallest use in saying they dare not or they will not. What is there they dare not, when all opposition to them has been surrendered or bought up; and what is there they will not if it suits them, which is for the most part the circumstance in which anybody else makes use of power? Twenty things may be mentioned, none of which people thought they either dared to do, or would. The past ought surely to be enough, to be our guidance for the future.

Knowing that our active friends are bestirring themselves in various directions for the revival of the popular cause, I take the liberty of introducing to their notice a schedule of the ways in which they are beset on all sides and round about, by the snares of past governments, to which the Whigs are heirs and executors at once. With just as much glee as a Whig ministry through the agency of a Tory magistracy puts an artisan accused of Chartism to the torture of the silent system, would it send you or me to eat kangaroo on any legal quirk that offered the temptation. I remember once discovering that I was living in the commission of transportable

offences at the rate of two a-day; my crimes consisting in communicating with Mr. Robert Owen when he was in some state of legal impurity. The plan is to make us all transportable, and then we shall all be at the mercy of the ministers.

The following state of the law as it at present exists, is from the hand of one of the oldest and best-informed of the people's friends, who may be considered as having been personally engaged in the struggle since 1792. Whatever a man may determine as to the chances he will risk with his eyes open, it is always as well that his eyes should be open to the risk before he enters on it.

'LAW RELATING TO POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS.

'The tories, during their half-century of misrule, have heaped statute upon statute to prevent associations of the people. The acts which apply to political unions are the 39th Geo. III. c. 79, and the 57th Geo. III. c. 19. It will be seen by the following statement, that tory malevolence and tory lawyer-craft have been unable to prevent the formation of political associations at the present crisis.

'The Act of 39 Geo. III. *prohibited all sorts of correspondence and intercourse between societies whose proceedings were secret; and it also prohibited the appointment of delegates or other officers in all such societies; and it further declared that every such society was an illegal combination and confederacy, and that every member of such society, and every person not a member who held intercourse* with such society, was amenable to the punishments mentioned in the act, viz., *fine and imprisonment* on information before one justice of the peace, or on conviction by indictment *transportation for seven years.*

'*It did the same in respect to every political society which had any divisions or branches.*

'It did not prohibit societies which had no secret proceedings, divisions or branches, from holding correspondence with other such societies.

'It did not prohibit the appointment of delegates by such societies, nor meetings of such delegates.

'It was therefore lawful for any society which had no secret proceedings, to correspond in any way it pleased with other societies; and to appoint delegates to meet and transact business with the delegates of other societies.

'But during the administration of Lord Castlereagh, the liberties of the people, which had been very much abridged during the administration of Mr. Pitt, were thought to be still too great, and it was concluded that the more the intelligence and consequent good conduct of the people increased, the greater was the necessity to destroy their "rights and liberties," and *an act was therefore passed with this intention, subjecting all political societies to the penalties of the act of* 39 *Geo. III.*

'*No political society can therefore hold correspondence or intercourse*

with any other such society, nor appoint delegates to confer with one another on any matter relating to the society, &c. &c.

'These acts, disgraceful as they are to the legislature and to the nation, do not however prohibit any Union from recommending the establishment of other Unions. They do not prohibit any Union from sending instructions to any body of persons for the formation of other Unions.

'They do not prohibit any Union from appointing delegates to meet persons desirous of forming Unions, and assisting to conduct their proceedings *to the moment the Union is formed*, but all such interference must cease before such Union is declared to be in existence.

'They do not prohibit any one from being a member of as many Unions as he pleases.

'They do not prohibit any one from being a member of the councils of as many Unions as he pleases.

'They do not prohibit any one from saying in any Union or in the council of any Union, anything he pleases, as a member of the council or Union he is addressing, provided he is not, and does not take upon himself the character of, a delegate.

'Thus every man may see what he may and what he may not do under these new-fangled laws, which his father or grandfather would have declared the people of Great Britain never would submit to.'

It would be easy for a Whig agent with a little plausibility, to push large portions of our countrymen upon what would give the ministry power to pick and chuse out of them for Botany Bay; while the decoy-duck, as birds of that description are in the habit of comporting themselves, would coolly dive under the net, and produce himself to claim his reward from the hand that fosters him.

London, 10 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Nottingham Review.

No. VIII.

INTERESTS OF OPERATIVES AND CAPITALISTS.—CASE OF A NOTTINGHAM AND GERMAN HOSIER.

SIR,—When you assert that the interests of the operative classes are bound up with those of the capitalists, you will probably be met by the information, that all that can be cut off from the wages of the labourers is gain to their employers. And with this you shall see men run about in triumph, proclaiming that you have uttered something totally absurd, and that their reasoning has proved it so. And what is more, you will see people of authority and some character for keen-

ness, persuading themselves and the public that they have made great discoveries in opposition to your principle.

Now the answer to this is, that though it may be quite true that what one man can take from another he may gain, it is also true that there are circumstances under which he must both gain himself and let the other gain whether he chuses or not. It shall be conceded entirely, that the employer will give the operatives as little as he can help; and it shall be conceded on the other hand, that the operatives will leave the employer nothing but what they cannot extract from him. But all these considerations are only tubs for the whale, if used to distract the attention of the operatives from the interest they have in the improvement of the trade by which they are to live.

Let a Nottingham operative then put the case, that German hosiers are cutting his employers out of the American trade, because they can give their labourers the same meal out of one pound of cotton that his employers can out of two. There is no operative so ill-informed, as to think it is from malice in his employers, that his wages must either be stopped altogether, or be cut down as the means of trying to drag on a trade a little longer. All of them know in the present day, that both wages and profits must come out of the returns, and that if the returns are none, there can be neither wages nor profits at all. There may possibly be such a thing now and then, as an employer continuing to pay his men out of his savings, in hopes that the machine will go on again before long; but there cannot be found a child so simple, as to believe that this is anything but accident, or that he has any claim to be kept after the trade has ceased to pay for itself.

The necessary consequence therefore of such a failure of trade, must be that the employers in general must make the offer of smaller wages, or else stop altogether. The labourers will have their choice, of accepting less or none; there is no use in complaining of the fact, unless so far as the blame can be laid on some that are the cause of the trade ceasing to pay. Fishermen might as well complain, that fish have left the coast and none are caught. There may be no doubt of the evil to all concerned; but the last thing that sensible fishermen would expect, would be that the owners should continue to send vessels and nets to sea, and pay wages for dragging up sea-weed and cockle-shells.

But on the other hand, if trade improves, it is not at the option of the employers whether the operatives shall be better for it or not. Nobody is asked to trust either to their charity

or to their generosity; the connexion between one class of the concerned and another, is built on no such foundations. As it is not of malice that the employer gives fewer or less wages when the trade is bad, so it is not of virtue that he will give more or better wages when the trade shall mend. He does what he does in both cases, because he cannot help it. If trade improves,—which means that the employer can sell more goods,—he must engage more hands to make them; and if the fact was that a number of workmen were previously out of employ, they may be glad to be taken on at the same wages as were going before. But if there are not these workmen out of employ, or so soon as they shall have been taken on again, any further increase of demand for goods must be accompanied with an increase of wages. Somebody must be tempted to work more, and to this end must be offered not only pay for more hours, but pay at an increased rate per hour. And as the employers are only anxious to get the work done where they can, they will be under the necessity of giving more pay per hour to those also who do not chuse to work more hours than before. The labour of inferior hands, as for instance children, must also rise in comparative importance. The employer has an opportunity to make increased gains if he can only cause the goods to be fabricated he is to make them on; and therefore he will consent to give more and better wages, as the means of obtaining what will be left for himself after all.

And is not this really all that trade ever is, was, or will be? Men's minds have been set afloat after what the Spanish proverb calls "better bread than is made of wheat." There is an indistinct notion of something that might or ought to be done, whereby the condition of the working classes should be extravagantly benefited; the truth being that these expected modes of bettering themselves, are like the alchymy which was looked for by our forefathers, the true mode of gold-making lying after all, in free and successful industry and nothing else.

It is undeniable that the working classes have not shown themselves strong upon these questions. A very little delusion has been enough to run away with large masses of them to their damage. For example, would it or would it not produce an effect in Nottingham, to tell the operatives, that in wanting to get rid of the cause which makes it impossible to compete with the German, the employers want to pay less wages, and therefore the operatives must come to harm? It might be supposed that a very small portion of the insight

men bestow upon their own affairs, would be enough to show that the employers want *to give less cotton to the monopolists of food* for the daily support of their workmen, as the means of enabling them to give the workman more and better food after all. They want to enable the workman to buy his food with one pound of cotton instead of two pounds, in order that they may get the one pound where now they must shut up shop and get none, in consequence of the trade being taken out of their hands by the Germans who have no monopoly quantity of the goods from America to give for food.

London, 9 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editors of the Sheffield Iris.

No. IX.

THE SULTAN AND THE HOLY ALLIES.—THE LAST ABOMINATION BEFORE ST. JEAN D'ACRE.—FREEDOM AND HONEST TRADE, AND DOWN WITH PIRACY AND THE PIRATES!—THE GOVERNORS THE INFERIOR CASTE.

SIRS,—I beg to examine the reply of the *Independent*, and see how far it has made out any case.

It thus recapitulates, and with great fairness, the positions in dispute with me.—

'He takes the ground that we have given to France substantial cause of complaint, and that the quadruple alliance is in support of legitimacy. He alleges, also, that the first object of the European powers was to prevent the Egyptian troops from passing the Taurus, and that remonstrances were sufficient for that object. He asks, too, what would have been said of French perfidy, if it had appeared that while united with the other courts on the Eastern question, she had been seeking a separate object.'

But this was "at the latter end of last week;" and "the revelations of the present, could he have foreseen them, must have caused him to assume a different tone."

Now what are these revelations of the present, and how far do they display any approach towards the effects or tendencies assigned?

'The anomalous situation in which the Sultan and Mehemet Ali have for some time been placed, had lasted as long as it could. It was quite plain when the Turkish fleet passed, by treachery, into the hands of Mehemet, that either he or the Sultan must fall. Mehemet had pos-

sessed himself of a large share of the empire, and of the fleet. He must either be master of the Sultan, or be reduced to his proper dimensions. But whoever might have been the victor in an intestine war, the strength of the empire must have suffered, and its independence must have been overthrown by Russian occupation, under the treaty of Unkiar Skelessi.'

The first weakness in this, is in talking of the Sultan as if he was anything. The Sultan is a shadow, a falsehood, existing only in the imagination of the Holy Allies and for the execution of their designs. There is a boy at Constantinople that goes by that name; but the Holy Allies allow no will either to him or to anybody represented by him. He cannot make or propose a contract; any power he ever had, the Holy Alliance has taken from him. He is an emanation from Russian, Prussian, Austrian, and English gunpowder; and anybody that professes to stand by him, does it only from fear of the same influence. The sentiment of Turkish nationality (and Turks have their feelings on that head as well as other people) was taking shelter,—not under the guns of the Russians, the Austrians, and the rest of the Holy Allies, whom the Turks hated with as thorough a hatred as our forefathers would an army of "circumcised dogs" who had come to settle their affairs in the time of Elizabeth or Charles,—but under the forces raised and created by Mohammed Ali in Egypt. The Turkish fleet passed into the hands of Mohammed Ali by no treachery, but by the same conviction of his being the real depositary of Turkish power and nationality, which made the English fleet join William in 1688. The Turks were settling their own affairs like other people; that is to say in their own interest, and not in the interest of somebody else. But this was not the interest of the despotic powers of Europe; and the English ministry, to its eternal infamy, sided with the despots. And the mode in which this infamous association, which it is to be hoped the union of civilized men will first or last be yet strong enough to march upon and overturn, proceeded to prevent the strength of the Turkish empire from suffering and its independence from being overthrown, was by destroying its strongest member, and putting down the only portion of Turkish power which was in a situation to resist. A Turkish army, under directions nominally from the mock Sultan, but virtually from the office of the adjutant-general of the Holy Allies, may act against the Egyptians, in the same manner that an English army, if France and Spain had established an authority under the name of James the Second in London, would probably have acted against the supporters of the Revolution. But, setting

aside the facility with which one body of men may be temporarily pushed to shed the blood of another, the Turks and Egyptians consider themselves as one people and engaged in one cause; as was curiously demonstrated in the course of the last abomination of our enemies before St. Jean d'Acre, where the Egyptian troops declined to fire on a Turkish line-of-battle ship, although the Turks under duress, with a foreign commander on board and a foreign fleet ready to execute any sanguinary orders of a foreign tyranny in case of refusal, were obliged to fire upon their co-patriots. We must be rid of being made to pay for these bestialities. We were not born slaves, and there is no reason why we should become so. It may be all very well for politicians, who when the troops are turned out against the constitution and the law, exult in the victory of the grenadiers. But we are on the other side; it is our business to tread down such politics when we are able, as our fathers did, and we only bide our time.

'To preserve the peace, the Five Powers, England, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, addressed a joint note to the Sultan, requesting him not to take any steps himself for the vindication of his authority, thus themselves undertaking to maintain the integrity of his empire. Then what followed? Mehemet refused to give up Syria; France refused to concur in coercive measures, but as it now appears, was secretly labouring, as M. Guizot says—"to create for herself in the east an isolated policy—an isolated success." Now what was the object of France? That, too, is now revealed by M. Remusat, who says it is her interest to patronise the second-rate naval states, that they, with her, may form a counterpoise to the naval power of England.'

What France engaged in, was to prevent the Egyptians from marching to Constantinople. She never engaged to force them to evacuate Syria; the proof of which is, that she did what she could to hinder it. M. Guizot is a French Whig; and as such his object is to carry on an anti-popular government under the protection of the cannon of the Holy Allies. What he calls the "isolated success" which his predecessor proposed for France in the east, was the dissipation of the alliance of despotic powers, which now, with the aid of M. Guizot, is confirmed. If to this was added the object, represented as revealed by M. Remusat,—what more just, what more honourable object could a statesman or a nation have proposed; or what more directly accordant with the interests of the honest portion of the public here? The mistake always made with respect to us, and pushed in our faces with an unreservedness which amounts almost to personal offence, is counting us among the supporters of villainies,

which always sooner or later bring just punishment upon the guilty. We are no more the allies and fosterers of political highwaymen, than of those that trade upon private account. As the most honourable duty an English statesman among our ancestors could in his day perform, was to cherish and protect the smaller states whose power might form a counterpoise to that of the kings of France and Spain, who were the bullies and robbers of those times; so a French statesman, now that the charge of defending the independence of the European nations has been turned over into the hands of France, can do nothing more deserving of the world's applause, than in the precise words of the objector, "patronise the second-rate naval states, that they, with her, may form a counterpoise to the naval power of England."

There is no use in concealing the point where the great struggle lies. It is here. Are the people of this country to be made to pay for the maintenance of a brutally ill-applied naval power, with the sole objects of securing the hostility of the rest of mankind and the consequences which will at last result from it, and in the meantime seeing it used for the support and maintenance of the despotic combinations which it is the great popular interest in England, as everywhere else, to suppress? Are we in short to be the slaves and bottle-holders of a sea-despotism, from which we expect nothing but the misery that pirates generally come to; or do we aspire to being a portion of free and liberal Europe, anxious only to have our just share of power, under the condition of using it honestly as others shall? A quarter of a century ago, no man durst have raised this theory; and if he had, nobody would have followed him. It now neither lacks standard nor followers. The cry of the country is, "Freedom and honest trade with all the world, and down with piracy and the pirates!" We are in the situation of sensible and honest Algerines if such there were; who, though unable to help themselves under the misfortune of being born in a country which under the guidance of the predominant spirit was making the world its enemy, had yet the wisdom to perceive what such things tend to, and the inclination to oppose them.

It is not true that the European nations in general, and England in particular, *are* hordes of banditti willing to act on the directions of any dishonest knot of leaders who may get uppermost. That they do so act, may be the present fact; but that they act willingly, is a mistake. There is an undercurrent of resistance everywhere, which Providence in its

good time will swell into a tide. Like the Algerines we may be governed at present by our pirates and our thieves; but there is an honest population in the vallies and the plains, which wants only to rob nobody and not to be robbed, and to reap the harvest of its own fields without being hounded out either to kill or to be killed. The existing state of things turns on one point; *the governors are the inferior caste.* They are inferior in knowledge, in morality, and in habits; gilded knaves, stuck over with the fruits of the industry which they oppress, and mismanaging the concerns of honest men, because debility is sometimes a concomitant on virtue.

A Syrio-Egyptian empire under the protection of France, would be quite as honest and as much for our interest as a pretended Turkish empire under the protection of the Holy Alliance. But the peddling instinct is attempted to be roused against it, by accusing it of a design to cut off the route to India; the fact being all the time, that the Egyptian power made the route, kept the route, and gave to us miserable villeins the benefit of the route, in spite of all our feudal lords and enemies could do to hinder it. Look at the chuckling simpletons, who print under the nose of the Russian ambassador, that they go with his master because they are cheating him and his! The clown in the pantomime, who holds the door open for his wife's lover on the strength of what he will do to him as he comes out again, is only a shadow of this simplicity. The charge against M. Thiers' government of double-dealing, comes oddly in connexion with an English treachery revolting to all who have been used to decent society, and on which no man who has had that advantage, is bound to hold his peace.

I cannot come to the conclusion, that the reply of the *Independent* has touched any of the positions, with which it accurately represented me as setting out.

London, 3 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Suffolk Chronicle.

No. IX.

A "FARMER'S" PLEA FOR THE CORN LAWS.—EXAMINATION, ON HIS OWN GROUNDS.

SIR,—Your correspondent "A Farmer" of Plomesgate Hundred, feels it his duty to support the Corn Laws, "in point of equity to the landowners, as long as there is an old

and heavy national debt hanging over their heads, or until others can be found that are willing to take a part of the burthen."

The case is rested, therefore, on nobody paying any part of the interest of the debt, in other words of the taxes, but the landlords. Those who think nobody pays any taxes but the landlords, will still have the question to answer, why that should be a reason for things continuing as they are. And those who think they pay some of them themselves, will be of opinion that the "Farmer's" case breaks down on this ground first, and has to get through the difficulties of the other question afterwards.

And now, to what is sometimes figuratively called take the bull by the horns, suppose it granted without a shadow of dispute, that nobody paid any portion of the taxes but the landlords. Suppose, for argument's sake, there was a country where it was settled by law, that nobody should be allowed to pay any taxes towards the public expenses but the owners of land, and these were apportioned from time to time, like a parish rate, by such an assessment upon the last year's rent-roll of the country as should be required to raise the amount demanded. Would this state of things make it consistent with common sense, that the practice should go on, and foreign corn be excluded as the means of making compensation to these landlords, or helping them to pay?

What the landowners say is this—"We have had the making of the laws in our own hands, and have it still. We have allowed no man to enter the House of Commons who did not take an oath that he had a powerful pecuniary interest in our favour and against anybody else; and the House of Commons at this moment is composed of the same men, with the exception, at most, of a small number of accidental changes. Having then all the power in our hands, and with our eyes open to all that we were doing and the consequences, we determined to make laws as follows."

"First, we determined (having nobody else to help us or to hinder us) to make wars and contract debts of which the interest should be thirty or forty millions annually."

"Secondly, we determined (in the exercise of the same plenitude of power, and with nobody to prevent us from doing what we thought best) to lay the taxes for the interest entirely on ourselves. We were diligently careful that nobody else should pay a bit. We could not think of letting anybody have the smallest share; and we never did. We stand up now to affirm, or our friends and supporters for us.

that up to this hour nobody pays or has paid a fraction but ourselves."

"Thirdly, of the same mere motion, and after having chosen of our own heads and wills to pay every bit of the taxes ourselves, we determined to do another thing, which was to shut out foreign corn as the means of making us up the loss."

Now then, if you did all these things, *why did you do them?* And what sense is there in a nation allowing you to have your way (*even if this was a correct description of what you did, which it is not,*) an hour after the absurdity of the whole plan (taking it at your own showing, and leaving to another time the disputable facts) has been placed before its eyes?

Fancy an island of a thousand acres, which should inwardly be full of coal and other minerals, and in consequence specially adapted for being the seat of manufactures and commerce, but in soil only moderately productive, and therefore physically capable, under the best imaginable cultivation, of producing food for only a very limited amount of population. And suppose the owners of the minerals and other manufacturing capabilities, extend the products of their industry, till they find they can obtain corn in other places than the island, at a less price than *more* corn (not *any* corn, mind, but *more* corn) can be grown within its borders; which must clearly be a point to be speedily arrived at. Whereupon stand up the owners of the peddling acres (peddling and petty, manifestly, in value compared, with what might be the value of the other capabilities of the island,) and announce that they have a grand plan for the creation of insular wealth, and the happiness of the inhabitants that are and ever shall be. First, they say, they will engage to pay all the expenses of any kind the island shall ever be at of a public nature. And next, in return for this they will ask only one insignificant trifle, which is that the owners of the mineral and manufacturing capabilities will submit to agree, that they will never eat anybody's corn but the owners' of the peddling acres, and consequently work themselves to the bone to give the greatest possible quantity of their labour to the lucky soil-owners for the least possible quantity of corn, and so reduce the wealth and strength of the islanders to what can be fed and maintained on the produce of these few acres for the good of the owners, instead of expanding to the extent that might be effected by the free exchange of their industry for food.

This would be the neat and modest proposal, made by the soil-owners of such an island to the rest of the population.

And would not the answer immediately be, "Your pretence to pay all the expenses, and have a monopoly of corn to put the money into your pockets again, is a trick and a fraud, and you shall neither do one nor the other. You are to spend money on your own squabbles, and for what you happen to like, and then you are to recover it through a tenfold loss to us the other owners, on pretence that you laid down the money. Every shilling you chuse to spend, you are to recover through a process, that if it gives you one shilling, makes us lose the worth of ten; and for this we are to thank you, as the charitable people who say you pay the expenses of the island out of your own pockets." But if this would be the answer in an island of a thousand acres, why should it not be the same with any number of acres that can be specified?

And this is the statement of the case, under the admission that there is complete accuracy in the representations advanced. But will anybody admit, that nobody pays any of the interest of the debt but the landowners? On the contrary, is there any man who will come forward, and allow himself to be the lucky man that does not pay?

The conclusion of the "Farmer's" counsel is amusing. He virtually says, "All the mischief comes through having families, and wanting to keep them. Do not have families, and do not want to keep them. You discomfort us corn-growers exceedingly by it; give it over. Depend on it you could not keep them if we let you try; therefore we will take care you shall not. It is nonsense letting a man keep his children; he would only have so many the more, or somebody else in his stead. *The people cannot, by any possibility, indefinitely provide from without, for their growing numbers.* Therefore we will provide for them from within, by pinching the few that there may never be the many."

This is a corn-grower's argument, and a corn-grower's philosophy. It remains to be seen whether it will help to make the community lie quiet.

London, 10 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the True Scotsman.

No. VIII.

THE SOW THAT WAS WASHED.—LAWS AGAINST POLITICAL SOCIETIES, WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED AS ON THE POINT OF BEING REVIVED.

SIR,—The aspect of the times is such as to make no caution superfluous, on the part of those who may find themselves exposed to the effects of the resurrection of the Holy Alliance which has taken place. "The sow that was washed,"—or as some of your friends perhaps think, was never washed,—has returned to her wallowing in the mire, to use the rough phrase our puritanical ancestors would have lighted on, and the wild boars of every Prussian and Russian forest have risen up to meet her. Under these circumstances, we Reformers shall to a certainty be made pig's-meat, unless we contrive to take care of ourselves.

It is one of the decrees of Providence, than which none is more constantly and continually illustrated, that no man or set of men can stop in evil where they please. All that come to the gallows, are illustrations of this truth; and the fact is not less real, of political gallows-birds, if we could trace parties like individuals, through the different steps by which they arrive at the consummation of their punishment. The moment it occurred to the Whigs to act against their friends and with their enemies, and they had been so far left to themselves as to seal the compact in treason and in blood, the rest was for no man's guidance, but came within the dominion of that power, which whatever be the name it receives at different hands, seems bent on teaching mankind that impunity, though long continued, is not final. The evil must run its course, like a plague; and the blame of the whole must lie with the introducers.

It is plain therefore that the Whigs, having entered upon the course of the Tories in 1792, will have no resource but to go on. They must go on or be condemned to that extinction, which men always avoid as long as they are able, and lay the blame upon necessity. The accumulated feeling, both of 1792 and all that the popular mind has gained in strength and information since, they have made their enemy. They have done what the Tories in their hour of pride dared not venture on; and therefore it is not likely they can be less "bloody, bold, and dangerous" than their predecessors. In fact they have this great additional reason for launching out;

—the Tories in 1792 had an opposition, but the Whigs in 1840 have none. They have sunk the existence of opposition, by going over with arms and baggage into the opposite ranks; and the public knows too much of the individuals who from time to time have professed a mockery of resistance, to expect anything substantial from their efforts.

In this state of things, the persecution will speedily be hot against all efforts to establish or organize a popular power; and the thing that was, is the thing that will be, so far as rubbing up the old engines and machines to that end made and provided, can effect it. The Whigs have been most careful not to pull down the Tory instruments of power which bear upon this point; and the weight of them will fall upon the public with all the effect of an ambuscade, increased by the circumstance of the Whigs themselves having been great encouragers when it suited them, of trifling with the talons of the law, and setting at naught the risks of what a literal application of it might bring on.

I proceed therefore to offer some details on the principal rocks and shoals of law, upon which our friends are most likely to run in ignorance of the danger. They are furnished to me by one of the oldest and best-informed friends of the popular cause; one whose experience dates from the time of the ancient persecution, and therefore best fits him for offering advice for encountering the new. It will not be "*Christianos ad leones,*" but it will be "*Reformers to the hulks,*" whenever the Holy Alliance of foreign and domestic absolutes shall give the word.

'LAWS AGAINST POLITICAL SOCIETIES, WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED AS ON THE POINT OF BEING REVIVED.

'Political Societies are regulated and controlled by two acts of Parment, viz., 39 Geo. III. cap. 79, passed in July, 1799; and 57 Geo. III. cap. 19, passed in March, 1817.

'The act of 39 Geo. III. is "an act for the more effectual Suppression of Societies established for seditious and treasonable purposes, and for better preventing seditious and treasonable practices."

'"It enacts that every society (political) shall be deemed an unlawful combination and confederacy in any of the cases following:"—

'1. "If any member take any oath or test, or subscribe any declaration or engagement not required by law."

'2. "If the names of any members be kept secret from the society at large."

'3. "If it have any committee or select body, the members of which are not known to the society at large to be members of such committee or select body."

'4. "If it have any President, Treasurer, Secretary, Delegate or other officers, whose election shall not be known to the society at large."

'5. "If any of the names of the committee, select body, President, Treasurer, and other officer, be not entered in a book or books open to the inspection of all the members."

'This act specially named the "London Corresponding Society," as one of the societies to be put down. This society had no secret proceedings, and might therefore have continued in existence under another name; but it had "Divisions" or branches, and held intercourse with other societies as thus connected, in various parts of the country.

'Its purpose was to obtain Annual Parliaments, Universal Suffrage, and Ballot. It was therefore to be extinguished by law, and for this purpose was added,—

'6. "Any society composed of different divisions or branches, or of different Parts, acting in any manner separately or distinct from each other, or of which any Part shall have any distinct President, Secretary, Treasurer, Delegate or other Officer, elected or appointed by or for such Part, or to act in any office for such Part."

'Having declared the cases in which political societies shall be deemed unlawful combinations and confederacies, it further enacts—

'7. "That every member of every such society, and every person who shall directly or indirectly maintain correspondence or intercourse with any such society, or with any division, branch, committee or other select body, President, Treasurer, Secretary, Delegate, or other Officer or member thereof as such; or who shall, by contribution of money or otherwise, aid, abet, or support such society, or any member thereof as such, shall incur"—certain penalties.

'The penalties are of two kinds, viz.—

'1. "By summary process or information before one Justice of the Peace, on conviction, a fine of Twenty Pounds, or three months imprisonment in the common gaol."

'2. "By Indictment, on conviction, Transportation for Seven Years."

'It will be seen that this Act prohibited,

'1. All societies having oaths of any kind, or any test or declaration, or engagement—which the law does not direct to be taken or subscribed.

'2. All societies having branches or divisions or parts.

'3. All deputations to or from such societies.

'4. All contributions of money or other assistance of any kind.

'5. All correspondence with any such societies or any member thereof as such.

'This Act had—1st—no relation to separate and distinct societies which had no secret proceedings.

'2. It did not prohibit the appointment of delegates, &c. by such societies.

'3. It did not prohibit correspondence between or with such societies.

'Thus the law remained until 1817.

'It had become convenient to the Castlereagh Administration to promote and encourage riots and conspiracies—and Castle, Oliver, Edwards, and others, were employed in consequence. Prosecutions

became common; men were transported, hanged, and dismembered; Green Bags, Secret Committees, contrived attacks upon the Prince Regent, Reports to both Houses of Parliament, were resorted to in aid.

'These contrivances frightened and stultified the nation as it was intended they should, and gave the then administration the power to introduce the Act of 1817—which, be it remembered, was at first supported by the Whigs, and to the moment of its enactment, was opposed more in form than in reality by them.

'The result of these proceedings was the act 57 Geo. III. c. 19.

'It enacts—That every society (political) shall be comprehended under the provisions of 39 Geo. III. before recited.

'The enactments are in the following words, viz.—

'1. "Every Society or Club that shall elect, nominate, or employ any committee, delegate, representative, or missionary, to meet, confer, or communicate with any other society or club, or with any committee, delegate, or induce or persuade any person to become a member thereof, shall be liable to the penalties of 39 Geo. III., cap. 79"—namely,—Fine, Imprisonment, or Transportation for Seven Years.

'2. "Every person who shall become a member of any such society or club, or shall act as a member thereof—every person who shall directly or indirectly maintain correspondence or intercourse with any such society or club, or with any committee, delegate, representative, or missionary, or with any officer or member thereof as such, shall be liable to the same penalties and punishments."

'3. "Every person who shall by contribution of money or otherwise, aid, abet, or support such society or club, or any member or officer thereof as such, shall be liable to the same penalties and punishments."

'Such is the Law.

'It has, however, no relation to public meetings, or to the appointment of delegates at such meetings. It relates solely to Societies or Clubs; and therefore whatever could be done before the 39 Geo. III. by public meetings, can be done now.

'Every administration for a century past has, whenever it suited any purpose, employed spies to get up Societies, Clubs, &c., to induce the commission of illegal acts, and then to imprison, transport, and put to death, those among the offenders who were most obnoxious. What has been done, it may be concluded may be done again, and if the "New Organization" going on in some parts of the country be brought into practice, it is probable it will be countenanced, encouraged, pushed on, and then it will be weeded of those who may be most likely to annoy or perplex the powers that be, and in the same manner as many hundred individuals are now imprisoned, may the like or any other convenient number be Transported for Seven Years.'

These are the laws, which must be executed whenever the Holy Alliance branch in this country is bid to do it by its masters. A twelvemonth ago we were men who laughed at

what all the Holy Alliances in the world might wish or might abhor. We have lived to know how much our "good reformers" could accomplish in a little time.

London, 9 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Bolton Free Press.

No. XI.

CAN A CORN LAW MAKE PROPERTY MORE VALUABLE?—MR. MUNTZ'S PLAN FOR COMFORTING THE LANDLORDS WITH CHEAP SHILLINGS.

SIR,—To pursue the subject of Mr. Muntz's letter, it really appears in some places to show symptoms of the extraordinary persuasion, that the Corn Law, that is to say the prevention of the existence of corn in the country which might be had for allowing it, *increases* the "value of property, produce, and wages." It comes in, more than once, by the bye; as if it were a thing not at all needing proof, but visible to the naked eye of all beholders. Whereas the fact is, that this is all what is most stoutly resisted by the opposite side. They say, that the exclusion of food simply increases the quantity of all other men's labour which must be given to the owners of land for a bushel of corn, at the same time reducing the mass of property and produce in the country, to what can be raised upon the small stock of food instead of the great. And if stress is laid upon the word "value," then all that can be admitted is, that the "value" of a bushel of corn is artificially and wrongfully made to be great in comparison (for example) of yards of cotton, and the "value" of a yard of cloth made small in comparison with pecks of corn; the number both of bushels of corn and of yards of cotton in the country being at the same time reduced below what would otherwise be the case. It is an odd application of the word "value," which calls this an increase in the value of property and produce.

This being the mischief resulting from the Corn Laws, it becomes desirable to sum up with equal distinctness the mischief arising from tampering with the currency; for it is plain the writer of the Letter has an idea, that these two mischiefs are together to compound a good, or at all events a neutralization of evil. It may be the fault of the examiner, or there may be some obscurity in the original statement, which prevents a clear view of the mode of this operation from being

produced; but, pending the circumstances, the only resource seems to be to sift the effects of both processes, and see whether any such tendency appears.

'The *Corn Law Circular* says that the landlords know, if 5*s.* were made into 7*s.* 6*d.*, it would only reduce the value of the shillings, and not advance the value of the wheat. No doubt they do; but, possibly, they may also know, that with the same money which they will receive for their rent, they can pay for their taxes, the interest on their mortgages, their necessaries of life, their servants' wages, and the far greater proportion of all their expenditure, and at the same prices which they now do; and that is all they require.'

It becomes interesting to know what parts of this may be conceded to be correct. If shillings were multiplied till they had only what is the present value of sixpences (which is the plainest case for general experiment), the landlords know that with the five new shillings they might receive for an acre of land instead of the five old, they could pay their taxes *till they were doubled as they would be in the first session of parliament*, unless, what comes to the same thing, they happened to be fixed by an *ad valorem* rate already. They can pay the interest on their mortgages; in other words, the mortgagees and not they, happen to be the people who are to be robbed. They will pay with them for their necessaries of life, till the prices of these necessaries double, *which will be to-morrow*. They will pay their servants' wages, till the servants have the wit to request that since shillings are sixpences, they may receive two for one. And small trouble will this give to the landlords either; for they will know they have the remedy like other people, of demanding a double number of the sixpenny shillings, for what themselves have to sell, in other words for their rents. Comes therefore the whole to what has been stated before, that alterations in the value of money, like alterations in the length of the yard-wand, have no effect upon anybody except so far as he may happen to be entrapped by bargains in one direction, not balanced by an equal number of bargains in the other.

And here seems to follow some light on the nature of the mysterious benefit, which is to arise from accompanying the repeal of the corn laws with an issue of bad shillings.

'It is not by any *advance* of their prices of produce, that an alteration of the standard to 7*s.* 6*d.* would benefit them; but their advantage would be found in its preventing that ruinous further reduction in prices, which the direct repeal of the corn laws must force upon them; and which must be followed by a consequent reduction in all home trade, and home labour.'

When the landlords look at the cessation of their monopoly price of corn, they are in some way or other to be comforted by seeing two bad shillings going for a good one. They are not to find out that they finally get only two hours' work of the manufacturer for a peck of corn instead of three, and that the power of robbing the manufacturer of that third hour's work is departed from them;—and this through their attention being distracted to the undiminished number of shillings which passes through their hands. To put it in fresh words, removing the corn laws would cause a diminution in the price most unpleasant to the landlords, as for argument's sake from ten shillings to five; but halve the value of the shillings, and the landlords will get ten shillings as before, and never find out that they are damaged by the process. That is to say, they are to chuckle over their ten shillings, and never discover that they buy only half what they used to do. This is the nearest that has been arrived at, to a clear idea of what the author's proposal is.

'The *Corn Law Circular* editor says that, by my proposal, all *public* and private creditors will be robbed one-half; and again, that all *taxes*, rents, wages, &c., must be raised in proportion to the alteration of the standard. How both these wonderful changes are to arise I cannot comprehend, neither, I am sure, can he.'

If the editor has overlooked the fact, that to creditors in the routine of trade, who pay with one hand as fast as they receive with the other, alterations in the value of the currency are nearly inoperative, he will probably consider of it another time. But except this, there seems nothing on which any doubt can be thrown. Does any man doubt or deny, that public creditors will be robbed one-half? Does any man feel the smallest doubt, that the diminished value paid in taxes will always be an effectual argument in the hands of a Chancellor of the Exchequer for getting them raised in the opposite proportion? Rents may be kept back temporarily by the operation of leases; and wages may be always a day's march behind. But none of these amount to making any serious inaccuracy.

The following passage cannot be quoted without a bitter regret, accompanied with something like a non-comprehension of the possibility, that a writer who has all his life been conversant with the details of commerce, and whom numbers of his compatriots agree to pass for a leader in their Israel, should have been so unsuccessful in framing a conclusion upon the case he takes in hand.

'Like all men who are governed by feeling, he [the editor] makes woful blunders; and believing that, according to Scripture, it is unholy to raise the price of bread to the poor man, forgets entirely that it is equally unholy to reduce wages, so that the poor man cannot buy the bread; and so recommends a repeal of the corn laws, unaccompanied by any other measures, which would necessarily reduce wages to the continental level, and make them lower in proportion to the price of corn then, than they now are.'

If nothing has been advanced in support of this, but a fallacy on the effects of halving the yard-wand or splitting the shilling, may not this also come under the category of "woful blunders"? But more light may be had by going on.

'For it is in vain to talk of the bare repeal of the corn laws relieving the manufacturing poor. Why, the professed object of the repeal is to enable the merchant to compete with the foreigner. And how can he do that, unless by a reduction of wages?'

By getting rid of the part which is payment to the corn monopolist. Of all unsupported and gratuitous connexions, that which declares that because the manufacturers want to compete, *therefore they must want to reduce wages*, is the most incomplete and indefensible. It might just as well be said, *therefore they must rob on the highway*. There may be room for a currency fraud after all, arising out of the fact that if the price of bread is to fall, it is among possible things that the operative may get more bread and yet with less money. But that he must get more bread, is the first consequence that must arise; for if he did not, there would be nobody to eat it. And if he will allow himself to be deceived by the money-jinglers, who tell him to call for the more shillings which shall buy less, he deserves it for his pains.

In my next, with your permission, I will offer a statement of the precise way in which the corn monopoly prevents the Birmingham or Bolton trader from competing with the foreigner. From which it will be seen how much the reduction of wages has to do with the affair.

London, 17 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Dundee Chronicle.

No. IV.

WHY PEOPLE CANNOT GO BACK TO THE LIVING OF A.D. 1050.

SIR,—As my object is always to assist if I can, and not to oppose, I take the opportunity of thanking the energetic lec-

turer (Dr. M'Douall) in your Thistle Hall, for the way in which he has directed the attention of the public, and of the working classes in particular, to the statistical facts (for nothing less than that long word is the term demanded), from which the nature of their present position and its remedies is to be collected.

But supposing it possible for the persuasive powers of the lecturer to effect a determination in all classes of society to set instantly about returning to that ancient state of things when the wages of the daily labourer could provide a pound of beef with bread at discretion for every member of his family, should we not speedily run upon the question, of where all this beef and bread was to come from? It is clear, that on the most moderate computation, we should want twice as much beef, and half as much more bread, as is in existence now. Where then is this to come from? Beef and bread are produced now, from the soils whence they are obtained at all, to the extent of what can be effected with a profit; and nobody in this world will do anything for love. Does not this then point to the fact, that if the working classes had as much as they could eat, *it must come from somewhere else;* and that as long as it may not come from somewhere else, it is in vain for the working classes to wish for as much as they could eat?

If the working classes or the population in general, would consent to be reduced to the same numbers they were in A.D. 1050, and keep there, there would at all events be no physical impossibility in their having the diet of A.D. 1050 again. But if they have quadrupled their numbers since, while the produce of the land has only doubled or trebled, there seems nothing strange in the consequence that, so far as the inquiry has yet gone, the numerous classes must eat less.

There *was* a way, it is true, which seemed specially ordained to stave off the arrival of this short-allowance time. And this was, that by the favour of Providence our island was filled with minerals and other capabilities for carrying on manufactures, to an extent which might have enabled the inhabitants to go on creating the means of obtaining food in return for industry, for ages after the acres which made the upper crust of their island had got to the utmost of their production. Besides which, they had harbours and "sea privileges," which might have enabled them to accumulate great wealth by their labour, as mere carriers by sea, even if it had pleased Providence to give them not an ounce of coal or iron in the bowels of their land, nor a square yard of fruitful soil upon its surface. One wealth is not all wealths, nor one kind of good all kinds; and the man who was in posses-

sion of a sea or a manufacturing "privilege," was as truly in possession of a substantial portion of Heaven's benevolence as the other who had been born to the inheritance of broad acres of the external clay.

But so it was, that the owners of the external clay undertook to disinherit the others, and those others were simple enough to submit to it. They rose up against the owners of manufacturing and commercial capabilities, and against the myriads of labourers whose living was dependent on the promotion of those branches of industry, and they declared that no use should be made of the powers which nature had bestowed, except so far as they the lords of the upper soil could make no gain by hindering it. Wherever they could discover an interest in cutting the others off from the use of their property, they claimed a right to do it. For an owner of mines or rivers to have prevented the free and full use of the upper soil, would have been an enormity to be repressed by every species of force; but for the owners of the upper soil to stop the proceedings of the men of underground or watery businesses, was held to be in the course of nature and exactly as it ought to be.

Now does not this point to the great use to be made of the statistics of A.D. 1050? The working classes cannot have beef and bread as then, because it is not here to be had; and it is not here, because the law will not let it; and the law will not let it, because the law-makers take care to make it so; and they take care to make it so, because they have all (with a score or two of accidental exceptions) taken an oath and no perjury at all, that they are the holders of that upper soil, which claims the right of interfering with the under elements and with the watery.

It does not need much exertion to perceive, that if this be true at all, the consequences must be extended over the working classes in general, and not confined to those of the particular businesses which may suffer first. The evil is, a shutting-up of the whole population upon the food producible on the island; and one class of labourers cannot be permanently living in misery, without equalizing with the rest.

Whether anybody would like to see this altered, and when, is a matter for everybody to determine for themselves. But it strikes me as very useful, to direct the attention of all who are curious about the wages of A.D. 1050, to the causes which keep up the impossibility of the same thing existing now.

London, 10 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XL.

SALE OF THE POPULAR CAUSE BY THE RADICALS IN PARLIAMENT.—THE LEEDS REFORM ASSOCIATION.

SIR,—The Circular of your Leeds Parliamentary Reform Association, is an invitation to a discussion of the causes which led to its formation, and the consequences likely to result from it.

When the desire for reform in parliament,—that is to say, for a more just and equal division of the powers of government,—was sufficiently extensive to open a prospect of carrying the measure now known under the title of the Reform Bill, it was plain that the acting force was a composition out of many. The most zealous but the least substantially powerful were the Universal Suffragists; while the least active but possessed of the greatest share of present power and influence, were the aristocratic Whigs, who had been often strong enough to take the government into their hands, and looked forward to doing it again. And between these extremes, might be classed all the different varieties which in one way or other claimed to be reformers.

As ordinarily happens on occasion of like combinations of men with many differences of opinion and a few coincidences, there were no very clear stipulations for anything beyond the co-operation which was to effect the success immediately in view. But there were certain negative understandings, impressed by common policy and the custom of mankind in like cases. For instance, there was to be no treachery, no fraud, no gross and unnecessary violation of the friendly feelings which had led to the alliance. It was plain that the union could not continue operative, unless by a very considerable modification of the wishes of all extreme parties; but it did not seem out of reasonable probability, that some such modification might take place.

And the modification which would have occurred to a reasonable arbitrator, even though taken from the classes considerably on the Whiggish side of the middle point in the scale of differences, would have been that the aristocratic Whigs, who by the necessity of the case were to be the holders of the government, should carry on a gradual and continuous reform of admitted evils, and particularly of those which they had themselves, while excluded from the govern-

ment, been in the habit of exposing. An astute friend of the Whig party, might have gone further and hinted to them, that a very little in the shape of progress would have gone a great way,—that it would be next to impossible for the more ardent classes to get up any formidable opposition, so long as it was let off from time to time by ever so small an opening of the valve in the shape of a little more reform,—that in point of fact they might possibly do without it altogether, as long as they stuck by their own manifesto of "Peace, Retrenchment, and Commerce," or at the very most, let off a little now and then, when circumstances were not favourable for sheltering themselves under the umbrella of the other.

The Whigs did the very contrary of what such a cautious counsellor on their own side would have recommended. When they went to an election in consequence of the demise of the crown, there was no instance of the Radicals (as was the term of distinction in those days) not playing them fair; on the contrary they resisted all temptations to increase their parliamentary strength at the expense of the Whigs. But when the Whigs got their parliament, it appeared that they had been organizing and preparing two distinct breaches of all treaties, and had carefully reserved the expression of their intentions till the elections should be past. Those two were, the declaration of the minister in the House of Commons that he had always thought "the preponderance of the landed interest tended to the stability of the institutions of the country;" and the declaration of the finality of Reform. Both these were distinct acts of treachery; if such opinions lived in the minds of the Whigs or of their leaders, they were such as ought in common decency to have been communicated, before the parties who were sure to dissent, had been committed to a co-operation for the formation to their own damage, of what might possibly be a seven years' House of Commons.

The treachery to the Radicals being clear, the next question was whether the representatives of the Radicals in parliament had either the means or the inclination to resist, or if they could not alter what was past, to oppose the accumulation of the consequences. And here the expectations of the Radicals in the country, if they ever had any, were a failure the most complete. The minute section of decided and active Radicals in the House of Commons,—a mere spark at all times in point of magnitude, but one which might at any time under certain combinations lead to important consequences,—had been entirely thrust out and trodden down, with the help,

in some degree, of their own determination not to be peace-breakers with the Whigs;—and their efforts to recover themselves, had been met in some instances with furious opposition on the part of the nominal Reformers, to the extent of introducing a Tory by preference, where the success of their own candidate was from the beginning perfectly impossible. It was pretty plain what was coming. The pretended Reformers were going to sell. They were going to bargain with the ministry for the non-employment of the weapons in their hands, which consisted in the power of threatening to turn the ministers out; and they bargained accordingly, the principal part of the price being the compliance with certain demands in Ireland, branching off in the shape of Irish seats to various of the English Radicals in want of such accommodation.

The consequences were not slow in declaring themselves. The ministry had purchased an impunity, cheaper and more important than any that can be found in the history of administrations. On two out of three points to which it had in old times committed itself, Peace and Retrenchment, the great mass of its political opponents were perfectly well disposed to support it in any act of recantation, and to hail the return of the wanderers to the fold. And they returned accordingly; with what success, let the gazettes and the next budget bear witness.

The object of the new Reform Association of Leeds then, it would appear must be, to do what the professed Radicals in parliament ought to have done but preferred to barter with the ministry. Or it is to do so much of it, and so much in addition to it and in consequence of it, as circumstances then and since shall bring within the power of performance. If the Leeds Reform Association like, they may sell off their stock to ministers again as soon as they have accumulated any, as the Reformers in parliament did before them. But the question is, whether they will like, and whether their supporters who will get little out of the selling off, will leave things in such a condition as to allow them.

The Association therefore must take up the cause of progressive Reform where the Irish and English parliamentary Radicals betrayed it, and act now as those Reformers, if they had been honest and wise, would have acted then. In this they will undoubtedly be embarrassed by the attempts of the pretended Reformers to join and take possession of the movement; but like other men in circumstances of crisis, they must open their own eyes and exercise their own judgment. Of their prospects of success, it may be enough to say, that what the parliamentary Radicals might have done before, the

Association may have good hopes of proceeding gradually to effect now; with this circumstance in their favour, that one exposure of rotten instruments has been made to their hands.

London, 20 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leicestershire Mercury.

No. IX.

GOVERNMENTS' JEALOUSY OF "CORRESPONDENCE."—LAWS RELATING TO POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS.

SIR,—After having asserted in my last that Charterism is extending upwards, I know not what can with more propriety follow, than an intimation of some of the perils by which its progress may be beset.

Every popular sentiment endeavours to clothe itself with force by means of union. All anti-popular governments, therefore, have an instinct for the prevention of union among the members of the community. The imperial government of Rome refused to allow an association of firemen in the metropolis; so far did it carry its dread of men being gathered together and comparing notes on their interests and feelings. The British government of 1792, which put down the Corresponding Society the object of which was to obtain Parliamentary Reform, was actuated by a similar dread. To correspond, is only the means of obtaining force by union. There is nothing in corresponding, any more than in possessing the eyes or fingers which are the instruments of it, that is in itself hostile to just government. It is the government which knows its intention to be unjust,—and which would be equally tempted to remove the eyes and fingers if the danger were not greater than the promise,—whose interest it is to prevent men from exerting their natural rights of communication with one another. Such a government virtually says, "We mean to be a government which men with hands and eyes, and the power of using them, will never tolerate; therefore, that we may be tolerated, we mean to take away the hands and eyes, or the power of using them."

But what one ill government does, another generally continues to preserve. It is desperately hard to get a government to throw down any portion of the fortress of misrule; and in reality the prospect may be considered null, unless the

phænomenon be ever witnessed of the people itself being governor. And so the consequence is, that the hands and eyes, whose use was prohibited by the government of 1792, will be equally illegitimate under that of 1841. Everybody does not know this; and the Whigs themselves have been great seducers, in the way of leading men to tamper with the perils of law. It remains then for every man to consider for his own behalf, how far he likes to trust the present government with the power of sending him to Norfolk Island; which is the remedy made and provided against those who shall prosecute reforms to the displeasure of the powers that be, and with the neglect of some form which shall allow the *diabolus* of the Crown to whisk his tail within the circle of their defence.

The following is a specimen of the snares by which all men are surrounded, who unadvisedly give way to their zeal for reform, in the notion that under a reformed ministry and a reformed parliament the thing is lawful and safe. The details have been furnished by one of the oldest and best-informed friends of the popular cause, who has been personally engaged in the struggle since the times which preceded 1792, and great confidence may consequently be placed on the accuracy of the whole. I think you will perceive there is strong reason to apprehend, that many of our friends are at this moment running their heads into a fire, of which they have not calculated the power or the effects.

'LAWS RELATING TO POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS, WHICH WILL BE PUT IN EXECUTION WHENEVER THE WHIGS MAY CHUSE.

'Political Societies are regulated and controlled by two acts of Parliament, viz. 39 Geo. 3. cap. 79, passed in July, 1799; and 57 Geo. 3. cap. 19, passed in March, 1817.

'The act 39 Geo. 3, is "an act for the more effectual suppression of Societies established for seditious and treasonable purposes, and for better preventing seditious and treasonable practices."

'It enacts that every society (political) shall be deemed an unlawful combination and confederacy in any of the cases following,—

'1. "If any member take any oath or test, or subscribe any declaration or engagement not required by law."

'2. "If the names of any members be kept secret from the society at large."

'3. "If it have any committee or select body, the members of which are not known to the society at large to be members of such committee or select body."

'4. "If it have any President, Treasurer, Secretary, Delegate, or other officers, whose election shall not be known to the society at large."

'5. "If any of the names of the committee, select body, President, Treasurer, and other officer, be not entered in a book or books open to the inspection of all the members."

'This act specially named the "London Corresponding Society," as one of the societies to be put down. This society had no secret proceedings, and might therefore have continued in existence under another name; but it had "Divisions," or branches, and held intercourse with other societies as thus connected, in various parts of the country.

'Its purpose was to obtain Annual Parliaments, Universal Suffrage, and Ballot. It was therefore to be extinguished by law, and for this purpose was added,—

'6. "Any society composed of different divisions or branches, or of different parts, acting in any manner separately or distinct from each other, or of which any part shall have any distinct President, Secretary, Treasurer, Delegate or other officer, elected or appointed by or for such parts, or to act in any office for such part."

'Having declared the cases in which political societies shall be deemed unlawful combinations and confederacies, it further enacts—

'7. "That every member of every such society, and every person who shall directly or indirectly maintain correspondence or intercourse with any such society, or with any division, branch, committee, or other select body, President, Treasurer, Secretary, Delegate, or other officer or member thereof as such; or who shall, by contribution of money or otherwise, aid, abet, or support such society, or any member thereof as such, shall incur"—certain penalties.

'The penalties are of two kinds, viz.—

'1. "By summary process or information before one Justice of the Peace, on conviction, a fine of Twenty Pounds, or three months' imprisonment in the common gaol."

'2. "By Indictment, on conviction, transportation for seven years."

'It will be seen that this act prohibited,

'1. "All societies having oaths of any kind, or any test or declaration, or engagement—which the law does not direct to be taken or subscribed.

'2. "All societies having branches, or divisions, or parts.

'3. "All deputations to or from such societies."

'4. "All contributions of money or other assistance of any kind."

'5. "All correspondence with any such societies or any member thereof as such."

'This act had—1st—no relation to separate or distinct societies which had no secret proceedings.

'2. It did not prohibit the appointment of delegates, &c. by such societies.

'Thus the law remained until 1817.

'It had become convenient to the Castlereagh Administration to promote and encourage riots and conspiracies—and Castle, Oliver, Edwards, and others, were employed in consequence. Prosecutions became common; men were transported, hanged and dismembered; Green Bags, Secret Committees, contrived attacks on the Prince Regent, reports to both Houses of Parliament, were resorted to in aid.

'These contrivances frightened and stultified the nation as it was intended they should, and gave the then administration the power to introduce the Act of 1817—which, be it remembered, was at first sup-

ported by the Whigs, and to the moment of its enactment, was opposed more in form than in reality by them.

'The result of these proceedings was the Act 57 Geo. 3, c. 19.

'It enacts—That every society (political) shall be comprehended under the provisions of 39 Geo. 3. before recited.

'The enactments are in the following words, viz.—

'1. "Every Society or Club that shall elect, nominate, or employ any committee, delegate, representative or missionary, to meet, confer, or communicate with any other society or club, or with any committee, delegate, or induce or persuade any person to become a member thereof, shall be liable to the penalties of 39 Geo. 3, cap. 79,"—namely,—fine, imprisonment, or transportation for seven years.

'2. "Every person who shall become a member of any such society or club, or shall act as a member thereof—every person who shall directly or indirectly maintain correspondence or intercourse with any such society or club, or with any committee, delegate, representative, or missionary, or with any officer or member thereof as such, shall be liable to the same penalties and punishments."

'3. "Every person who shall by contribution of money or otherwise, aid, abet, or support such society or club, or any member or officer thereof as such, shall be liable to the same penalties and punishments."

'Such is the law.

'It has, however, no relation to public meetings, or to the appointment of delegates at such meetings. It relates solely to societies or clubs; and therefore whatever could be done before the 39 Geo. 3. by public meetings, can be done now.

'Every administration for a century past has, whenever it suited any purpose, employed spies to get up societies, clubs, &c., to induce the commission of illegal acts, and then to imprison, transport, and put to death, those among the offenders who were most obnoxious. What has been done, it may be concluded, may be done again, and if the "New Organization" going on in some parts of the country be brought into practice, it is probable it will be countenanced, encouraged, pushed on, and then it will be weeded of those who may be most likely to annoy or perplex the powers that be, and in the same manner as many hundred individuals are now imprisoned, may the like or any other convenient number be transported for seven years."

It is highly probable there is not one man in fifty who have been in the habit of mingling in politics on the popular side, who has not over and over been brought within the wind of transportation. For my own part, I well recollect the odd sensation, of discovering that I had been in the commission of transportable offences at the rate of two a-day; my crimes consisting in having communicated with Mr. Robert Owen, at a time when he was clearly under the ban of the law. It is nearly indifferent to a government desirous of arbitrary power, whether it can order the imprisonment or transportation of any individual at pleasure, without reason given, or

whether it reduces the whole community to such an habitual state of legal existence, that it has only to pounce upon such as it may desire to make its victims.

London, 17 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Manchester Advertiser.

No. XI.

IGNOMINIOUS WARS.—ANTI-NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS.—NATIONS SHOULD COMPARE NOTES.

SIR,—Seeing that you hold out stoutly against the system of disgraceful and ignominious wars which the Whigs are entailing on us, I cannot help submitting to your notice the great advantage which might arise to the honest portions of the population in the different European countries, if through the medium of the press or otherwise, they could establish a species of international communication independent of the governments, which are probably on all sides considered as having interests distinct from the national, or at all events as not to be trusted as the indices of the feelings of the community.

Suppose, for example, a deputation of the French people, from the industrious and intelligent classes who made the Revolution of 1830, could have presented themselves at Manchester and have said, "Do you Englishmen really "think you have an interest in being made the murderers "of Egyptians for the honour and glory of the Grand "Signor? Do you see even military glory in it; or is not "the great pig-butcher at Cork as distinguished a person-"age? And what are you to get by it, but strengthening "your government in the power of doing mischief to your-"selves? Calculate how many millions it will cost you, "all levied upon you by an act of treason, and in defiance "of the principle you sillily harangue upon, pretending "your taxes are levied by consent. Is it not true now, that any "rogue may spend your money, for any purpose however "contrary to your interests, and your representatives "so-called will protect him in it whether you will or not?"

Imagine a French deputation uttering this; and suppose that in your turn you were to say, "And why did not *your* "government, when it put you to the expense of sixty mil-

" lions sterling for a necessary armament, as it was part of " the intentions of the Allied governments should be the con- " sequence,—why did not it openly declare that it stood for " the right of nations to settle their own internal disputes; " and not enter upon a race of words with a phrase-monger, " with a dozen of gazettes to back him and no parliament " to control? Why when it put you to the expense of a war, " did it not at least give the world the benefit of knowing the " reason?"

And what would be the result of these mutual recriminations but the discovery, that both nations had governments acting upon principles distinct from those of the public interest, if not in both cases treasonably withholding the communications with the popular branch which the constitution had required. Which comes to what was set out with,—the exceeding use there would be in nations possessing means of intercommunication independent of their governments, at all events till governments are brought nearer to being transcripts of national interests than at present.

And suppose again the French deputation were to say, " Do you think it creditable for honest people, to allow their " money to be expended in forcing opium at the cannon's " mouth down the throats of the Chinese? Do not you see " it is just the proceeding, which you would term rascally " in anybody else? Would not you be much obliged,—do " not you think you would be seriously benefited,—by any " European nation or collection of nations, who would show " to the un-English individuals (for we know you disown " them) who manage your affairs, convincing reasons why " they had better let the Chinese alone, and let you keep " your honour and your money? Would not it be an ex- " cellent thing, if there was a sort of European police upon " these subjects, and the government which spends your " money upon piracy was the first to which it was applied?"

Upon which imagine the English to say, " And what better " was the conduct of your government at Algiers? When " the French people were in distress, and the Holy Allies of " 1793 were endeavouring to starve you, you got into debt to " the Algerines for corn, and thought it a favour. When " your tyrants were brought back by foreign arms, as was " rational enough they did not like paying your debts to the " Algerines. So when the Algerines pressed for their money, " an agent was instructed to be saucy to their chief, and if he " could entrap him into any rudeness in return, to report it " for the benefit of the Bourbon who did not want to pay your

" debts. And the agent succeeded in getting motioned aside " with a fan of feathers; whereupon your restored tyrants " proceeded to expend your veterans upon the Algerines, " under solemn professions of intending no permanent oc- " cupation, which as things have turned out, your enemies " knew better than ever to insist upon. And when you " changed your government in 1830, there was not genius " to get out of the snare; but sixty thousand troops have been " kept in a position where the success of a sea-battle would " at any time enable your enemies to cut them off, and the " dread of this very contingency has been a principal cause " of the humiliation you have just undergone."

What would all this amount to, but two nations comparing notes and discovering, that they had both got anti-national governments, moving upon objects distinct from, and hostile to, the interests of the community? The next step to which would be, the observation that all this took place, because the government was so constructed as to make such hostility inevitable;—because the government was framed to keep out popular interests and good sense, and not to let them in;—because it was devised so as to secure to an executive the power of doing wrong at pleasure, and reckoning for it afterwards;—because, in short, the governments on both sides wanted reform and effectual amendment in the popular direction.

If two nations could thus understand each other, and bring the sensible and honest portions of each country into contact, it would not be in the power of the disorderly and unprincipled classes to push them upon a mutual destruction of each other's interests for the benefit of those who might make a picking by the conflagration. The signs are everywhere, that modern governors, though disguised under the title of representatives, are of the kind that look forward to warm themselves by the fire of their neighbours' houses, to say nothing of transferring the furniture to their own.

London, 17 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Nottingham Review.

No. IX.

GURTH THE SWINEHERD.—*Our* COLLAR IS AN ACT OF PARLIAMENT.

SIR,—Having endeavoured to show how impossible it is for an increased demand for Nottingham goods to take place without extending itself in the shape of improved wages to the workmen, and how inevitably the demand for Nottingham goods abroad, depends on the power of exchanging the foreign goods in which the return is made, for a free and not for a monopoly-diminished quantity of the corn which must feed the labourer; let me try to trace the consequences to the manufacturing capitalist and merchant, from the same circumstances which have been applied to the operative.

From whence come *failures in business*, or what in more gentle language still, is called *being unfortunate in trade?* Is it necessary there should be men unfortunate in trade; or are all who are so, deficient in some remarkable way, in conduct, or in ordinary luck? Are the names in the *Gazette* limited, for instance, to those of drunkards and men whose ships go the bottom without insurance? Everybody knows it is not so; and that success in business is rather the exception than the rule.

And how should it be otherwise, when the rule is, that merchants and traders may bring up their children to their own way of life, but the efforts of all of them together shall be always limited to working upon a given quantity of corn to be divided in return? Petty openings are from time to time proclaimed, in the shape of marauding expeditions to India or elsewhere; the effect of which is like that of state lotteries, where a few prizes of ten or twenty thousand pounds are given to the lucky, and four times the amount levied from the unlucky. But the great staple of honest commerce is prohibited by law. A Nottingham man may "list," and if he have the luck to escape all risks, may display himself twenty years afterwards with an income of a shilling a-day. But a Nottingham man may not make stockings and sell them to the Americans, who would make him a flourishing trade; because the law will prohibit. Thus it is, that we are in fact personal slaves, doing the servile work of our landed aristocracy as our forefathers did of theirs; not bear-

ing it written on a collar round our necks as in the days of Gurth the swineherd, but bearing it in an Act of Parliament, which without specifying us by name, as effectually says to us, this you may do or may not, because the landed aristocracy like it or the contrary.

It is perfectly astonishing what an appetite mankind in the mass have for giving a shilling's worth of their property for twopence. To refer to the last example, how many a manufacturer or merchant in your neighbourhood there will be, who would feel completely glorious at having one son what he calls provided for, by a portion of the plunder of India, or some kindred method of keeping him upon the public loss; and would perhaps make himself over, body and soul, to the Whig or Tory conservatives in consequence. And all this without finding out, that he had five more sons condemned to bankruptcy or else living on the paternal means, as the result of the system he supports. Is not this properly called, giving a shilling's worth of property for twopence?

It is of the more importance to impress these considerations now, because a grand effort has been made to distract men from the care of their substantial interests, by fixing them upon the glories of discovering, that one man better armed, better trained, and better fed, can kill two men who have nothing to make up for their inferiority in these respects, except that they are fighting against the thieves and robbers our government makes of us. What will be thought of all this, when the counterblow comes upon us, as in one way or other it almost always does in the end? How pleasant Englishmen will look, when foreigners come to dictate to them what goods they shall admit and what refuse; or to settle some dispute between Englishmen and an unpopular dynasty whom they attempt to resist. All this *will* come, all this *ought* to come; it is nature's only resource for human security at all. National crimes are no more to be compromised with by honest men than particular. The world was supposed to have made some progress in out-growing this childishness of wanting to live by robbery and mutual destruction. It wanted only a Whig minister in the holidays, to carry us back to the mud of a quarter of a century ago.

London, 16 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Perth Chronicle.

No. I.

ARISTOCRACY HATES HONEST COMMERCE.—DECLINE AND FALL OF WAGES.—TO EAT BEEF AND BREAD, IT MUST BE ALLOWED TO BE THERE.

SIR,—Having been informed of your willingness to admit me to a correspondence with your Journal, I can perceive no better way of commencing it than by taking up the contents of your paper of the 3rd which is now before me, for the chance of adding anything to the stock of reasoning and information it conveys.

The scoundrelisms our Whig banditti call wars, appear to be going on in all directions, without as yet any interference of Providence in behalf of us or the honest men. On the contrary, the power which I strongly suspect might be described under the scriptural expression of "the god of this world," which is the devil, appears to have gone forth with their armaments, and to be leading them on by successes of that kind which are so generally the final instruments of justice and retribution.

The struggle upon this point between the honest and the dishonest part of our community is simply this;—whether we are to be shut out from the just and equitable commerce which is useful to ourselves and to mankind, and to be forced instead to be the agents in the murders and pillages which may be profitable to an aristocracy. An aristocracy hates and despises honest commerce; it loves war and plunder, which hold out to it the chances of commands and peerages from the lottery of war. It is very much like the contest of the old feudal times over again. Honest trade is only to be permitted by stealth, and as it may be subservient to the convenience of the lordly robbers. The grand trade of all to which everything else is to be sacrificed, is the trade of the lord in plundered beeves, as the means of keeping his serfs in state for action.

Thus in Egypt and Syria we are to be made to pay for being accessory murderers, in deeds which even in a military sense convey no more honour than Swing's setting fire to his neighbour's corn-stacks with his tobacco-pipe; and this simply to indulge the propensities of one or two aristocrats who are in possession of unchecked power through the stupid device of what is called the "recess of parliament." But if

we attempted to reap the advantages of free and honest commerce with the same countries, the guns of the aristocracy would be instantly turned upon ourselves, and men would be quartered upon us in the shape of peers and pensioners, on the ground of having broken our bones as they have those of our friends and allies.

And you will see there will be no end of it. Independence and improvement will not show their faces in any part of the earth, without your being hounded out, or else told to work at home and pay out of your sinews and your toil, for putting them down to please your aristocracy. The very paper of to-day contains the news, that the messenger of your tyranny is gone to Vienna, to concert measures there in consequence of the extension of popular power in Spain. The object is to make us the enemies of freedom and free men all over the world; and no chance is left us, but declaring from the beginning, that we take the other side.

After this, allow me, as an old speculator on such subjects, to digress to some of the home questions which have been started in your neighbourhood. Nothing can be more useful than the attention which has been excited to various facts connected with the "Decline and Fall of Wages," which is one of the great peculiarities of our times. "A Chartist" justly suggests, that the cotton cloth which sixty years ago cost 5*s.* can be had for 4*d.*; and that if wages were compared with cotton cloth, they would appear to have improved. But still I surmise there will be no doubt on the whole, that wages have greatly diminished. The representation of the lecturer may have been an enthusiastic, and taken as a final statement, not quite a fair one; but food holds so great a proportion in the expenditure of a labouring man, that there is little doubt the balance is greatly on the side of loss.

Now how is this to be hindered or mended? Certainly not by saying that the old times were the good ones, and men ought to go back to them. How are they to go back to them? Without knowing the means, they might as well be exhorted to go back to the times when men lived to the age of Methuselah. They might be glad enough to go back; but how? Is there any chance that it will be done by agreement? Or would it be any nearer being accomplished, even though men were to agree?

Putting aside, then, all the impossibility that men should by talking be persuaded to do otherwise than they find it their interest to do, let it be assumed that all employers came forward with one consent, and said, "It is a great shame that every

labourer has not a pound of beef a-day for each member of his family, and as much bread as they can eat. There was a time when this was so, and therefore it shall be again." Fancy that all employers came to this resolution; and see, first, what they would run against; and secondly, whether we could not run against the same, without waiting till this most unlikely resolution had previously been agreed in.

Would not the first question be, Where is the beef and the bread to come from? There is as much raised now in this country as anybody finds it his interest to raise; and it comes to just a pound of beef a-day for the gentle and none for the simple, and of bread as much as they can eat for the first class, and two-thirds or half allowance for the other. To give as you propose, would require three times as much beef, and half as much more corn. Till it can be got, then, the thing cannot be done.

So here we come to the secret. Before the working classes can feed better than they do, what they are to feed on must be had. But the aristocrat-made law says distinctly it shall not be had. In A.D. 1050, the people were few, and corn could with comparative ease be got from our own land; just as in some parts of America at this day, a squatter may post himself, and if he can escape from agues and rattle-snakes, raise pumpkins for a dozen. But now the people are increased, and the land is the same as ever. Or if something has been done towards working up the inferior lands, it is clear that the numbers will have a tendency to overtake and go beyond it; as is proved by the men of pumpkins, who find themselves obliged to extend, and look for land elsewhere. But with us, the "land elsewhere" was not to be had. When we got to the salt water, there we must stop, or go and look for land so far off, and with such difficulties in getting there and afterwards, as at all events made a terrible discount on the desirableness of the trial. One way indeed was open to us. We were by nature independent of the land, to the extent at least of not being bound to starve when the land failed us. We had by virtue of the ocean, and the wealth of our country in other things than food, the means of obtaining food by the exchange and conveyance of those other things, to an extent that seemed almost endless. But an end was soon found for it. As soon as things came to the point, where an increase of food could be got easier by the owners of other kinds of wealth than from the owners of the corn soils, up stood the soil-owners and said no more should be got. And the owners of all those other kinds of wealth, and the operatives besides, quietly saw them-

selves limited to dividing the beef and the bread of the given acres among themselves and their posterity, with a certainty that the poorest must always have the least; and then they find it wonderful that the poor man's beef should come to be none at all, and his bread no more than shall enable him to struggle to breed up to starvation point.

Even if all men should agree that it was very proper the working classes should have a pound of beef a-day for each member of their families and bread at discretion, would not this be the difficulty immediately run upon? And would not the first inference be, If you wish we should eat it, you must let it come there to be eaten. And can we not come to that conclusion as it is, and see distinctly, that the first step towards giving the workmen their beef and bread, must be to open the roads by which beef and bread can be obtained in return for industry, or in other words, by commerce?

You see that the same aristocracy which is bombarding the Pasha of Egypt's towns, is only displaying its power of bombarding *us* if we tried to get the Pasha of Egypt's wheat. It is because he is our friend and would give us what we want if he might, that men are paid out of our pockets, to bombard him and us together.

London, 9 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editors of the Sheffield Iris.

No. X.

SOCIETY FOR PROTECTION OF AGRICULTURE.—ARISTOCRATIC NOTIONS OF TRADE.—THE HIGHWAYMAN AGRICULTURIST AND THE HONEST ONE.

SIRS,—I feel anxious to point out to your manufacturing and commercial readers, the prodigious ally they have got in the LONDON WEEKLY ORGAN of the SOCIETY for the PROTECTION of AGRICULTURE, which is put forth by the obtuse portion of the landed interest, by way of demonstrating their feebleness to the intelligent.

For it ought always to be borne in mind, that it is only the least-informed portion of the farmers who are led by their landlords into any active belief that their interest is involved in the robbery of their countrymen; to say nothing of the natural repugnance which as honest men they feel to being connected with an aristocratical felony. The schism is large and wide; and though the farmers are not the class from whom active interference against the existing law is to be expected,

any more than the manufacturers will be when they have got their "compensation" bounty on the importation of foreign corn,—there is a great and increasing number of them, and of the land-owners also, who see into the delusion attempted on the community and themselves, and will soon be among the concurrents in the demand for justice and retribution.

In the meantime our business is to promote the dissemination of what it is our plunderers put forward as the reasons for their operations; in order that sensible and honest men may see the kind of arguments by which the feudal tyranny is supported.

A writer in the *Anti-Corn-Law Circular* had described America as "a country separated now from us by a dozen days' voyage only, peopled by our own race, speaking our language, and possessing many of our laws, whose inhabitants are anxious to exchange their surplus food for the surplus clothing of our manufacturers." And he then commented on the injustice and wickedness of "slamming our custom-house doors in the faces of men who offer to supply us on the fairest possible terms with the necessaries of life which our population stand so much in need of."

Whereupon the aristocratic organ (*Farmers' Journal*, 23 Nov.) remarks as follows.—

'Let it be noted, that this writer in the *Anti-Corn-Law Circular* dwells with peculiar emphasis on the benefits, which the identity of our language and laws with the laws and language of the United States, secures to our trade with that country. But if foreign trade derive a large portion of its value from these circumstances, how comes it that this eulogist of our commercial intercourse with the United States should fail to perceive the tribute which he pays to the infinite superiority in value of our home trade to all other varieties of trade? If our trade with the Federalists of America be valuable, because they speak our language, what limits shall be set to the importance of that trade which our manufacturers carry on with agriculturists who are not only *like ourselves*, but who actually are *a portion of ourselves*? Yet the Manchester Chamber of Commerce would abandon their trade with English agriculturists, in favour of a trade with the corn-growers of the United States—one of the most cogent reasons urged in favour of the change, being that the corn-growers of the United States speak the same language as ourselves!'

View the fitness of the aristocratic organ to determine what we shall keep in our pockets. The American trader, who speaks English and has all other conveniences for our carrying on a trade with him, has corn to sell which it is for our interest to buy. But there is an English aristocracy at home, which also speaks English, and has corn to sell *which it is not*

our interest to buy. How stupid, that the Manchester men do not see, that they ought to deal with the last and not the first!

Why do not men always go to the shop that will offer them the worst bargain? Or if there is any reason why they do not always do it, what reason has the Weekly Organ of the aristocracy produced why they should do it here?

Take another specimen of the argumentative powers of their advocate.—

'Nor will it avail the enemies of the Corn Laws to equivocate as to their intention to secure the entire overthrow of English agriculture. True, indeed, they do, at times, allege that the repeal of the Corn Laws would actually extend the cultivation of the English soil; but such a preposterous assumption harmonises but ill with the recorded opinion of the lights of the free-trade school—the opinion that "the importance of England in the scale of nations, would be increased, if an encrustation of lava should doom the soil to perpetual sterility."'

What the "free-trade school" asserted, and what no man has attempted to disprove, is that England would be richer and more important in the scale of nations, if allowed to use her manufacturing powers to the exclusion of the powers of the soil, than if allowed to use the agricultural to the restriction of the manufacturing. What was stated was, that if one insanity was to be committed, the first would be the least of the two. The pretended intention to "ensure the entire overthrow of English agriculture," is only the plea of the housebreaker who tries to confound his dishonest labour with his honest. "You want to take away my tools, that I may not work at all." Nobody wants to overthrow any portion of English agriculture but the felonious. The part which is supported on the plunder of the community, is all we are anxious to rescind. We want to hinder you from being thieves, not from being farmers. We say you shall not rob, and that you shall be stopped; and see if it is not so in the end, as surely as of any other race that give employment for the constable.

'The Corn Laws, according to these honest calculators, cost the country upwards of fifty millions a-year; *therefore*, the Corn Laws ought to be abolished. But the fifty millions (!) in question cannot be saved (!) to the country, unless by entirely abandoning the cultivation of grain in England:—*therefore*, the object of the free-trade party is entirely to destroy English Agriculture, and, by consequence, to confiscate English Agricultural capital. And these results we are called on to assist in bringing about, in order that we may be able to buy grain from foreigners, *who speak the same language as ourselves!* Such are the miserable absurdities, in which the enemies of the Corn Laws involve themselves.'

If it were true that the whole of the grain cultivated in England, is cultivated and paid for through the plunder of the community, then the whole of it ought to be put down by law like any other felony. But it is *not* true. There is a portion and that the largest, which is an honest calling; and this we want to preserve, and free from the association of the other. But as specimens of argument, the Manchester Association ought to reprint and disperse gratis the reasonings of their opponent.

'But the gentlemen of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce can parade other reasons why a trade in corn with the United States ought to be deemed the most valuable of all trades.

'In the first place we are assured that the traders of the United States are willing to take our manufactured commodities in Exchange for American corn. This may be admitted to be an advantage—but it is an advantage, which surely belongs in at least an equal degree to our home trade. It has never, we believe, been alleged that our agriculturists are unwilling to take the products of Manchester, and Sheffield, and Leeds, in exchange for their grain and meat!'

That is to say, if you will exchange them for as little as they like. The American agriculturist is willing to give you a good exchange; and here stands up the highwayman agriculturist at home, and says he is willing to give you half as much, and he shall think you a fool if you do not deal with him for asking. What notions of trade these aristocrats and their retainers have compassed since they were born!

The "specie" fraud, is only the artifice of men standing up and saying, "You cannot allow foreign trade; it would take away your specie." And so long as there are men ignorant enough not to know, that a trade in specie is as good as a trade in coffee or any other foreign commodity for re-exportation, the fraud on the public must be to a certain extent supported.

A pleasant pass the merchants and manufacturers of England will have come to, when they are obliged to ask the agricultural monopolists to prevent them from incurring bad debts! Yet this seems to be the point they are invited to, by the argument upon the danger of American correspondences.

The aristocratic advocate seems to think he has made a discovery, in noting that a manufacturing monopoly in America can do harm to our honest manufacturers here. As if there was more in it than in the discovery, that a corn-growing monopoly here, can do harm to the honest corn-growers in America. When nations come to compare notes, they will find out at some time, that two losses do not make one gain.

Allow me to suggest to you, and all who like you have possession of the portals of the press, the utility of a perpetual turning-over of what the "robber caste" mistake for arguments.

London, 12 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Suffolk Chronicle.

No. X.

FARMERS AND TURNPIKE-MEN.—TURNPIKE-MEN MUST HAVE A REMUNERATING PRICE, NO REASON FOR KEEPING UP THE TOLL.

SIR,—On looking back into some of the discussions on the Corn Laws reported in the back numbers of your journal, I am struck with the fact, that the grand argument put into the mouths of farmers, is that they want nothing but a price that will pay.

Let us see what the machinery is, under which we are to be continually appealed to by what may be denominated the compassionate motive; and whether it is not one that would be applied as much as ever, though we should consent to pay ten or a hundred times the present price for corn.

The landlords, by the exercise of their power in the legislature, lay a tax to keep out foreign corn. Their undisguised object in this is to raise their rents; for whether there be reason in the various excuses they offer for it or not, they do not deny that they do it to raise their rents. And their rents are raised accordingly; that is to say, in the contracts which they offer to the competition of the farmers, the bidders, knowing that more money will come in, offer more for the contract. If the tolls on a given road were made twopence for a horse instead of a penny, and other things in proportion on the same principle, the turnpike-men would increase their biddings. The landlords then, having got out of the farmers by competition the highest biddings they can afford, next set the farmers to cry out, that they want nothing but what will enable them to pay. In the same manner if there were a proposal for lowering the tolls on a turnpike-road, the turnpike-men might be set to cry out, that they wanted nothing but what would enable them to pay, and nobody could be so hard-hearted as to refuse the twopence for his horse.

If the turnpike-men set up this plea, they would be told immediately they must go and amend their contracts;—that their

having jobbed the road, might be a reason for giving them a fair time to renew, but if they should have been absurd enough to enter into contracts for seven years or for ninety-nine, this would form no reason why the tolls should go on without diminution to pleasure them. A case might even possibly arise, for legislative interference between the contractors and the lessors of the road; but the last thing any man could make out of the matter, would be a reason why the high tolls should be continued.

In the same manner the farmers must not be allowed to be pushed forward, as the people whom we must support at the expense of paying a high price of corn because they bargained for it. Like the turnpike-men, they must go and bargain for less. Or if by their own incaution they have hampered themselves with leases, they must take it for their pains. Nobody has a right to lease out the public wrong, and expect the wrong to be continued in consequence of his contract. The landlord pockets all that the farmers can by competition be induced to spare; and he would do just the same, if the price were carried to any imaginable height. If the monopoly of corn were enforced and men multiplied, till they were glad to pay for growing corn upon flag-stones, and of course the rent upon all that was better than flag-stones was of enormous height,—the landlords would as much as ever be found sending the farmers round with the begging-box, on the plea that they wanted nothing but a remunerating price,—that is to say the price which would pay them for growing corn upon flag-stones, they having at the same time bargained with the landowners for making over all the excess that should accrue upon the better lands, in the shape of rent. Rent is the difference between the total value of the produce of land, and what the farmer can cultivate it for with a living profit. If, therefore, there is land of all sorts of qualities, as in most countries is the case, the worst land cultivated, will be that which will give the farmer's profit but no more, and in all the better lands the excess above this will be the rent. Hence the pretence that the farmer only wants what will pay him, is an ever-growing claim,—a claim which if corn were raised to a guinea a peck, would be as strong as ever in favour of its being two,—a claim which like the shoe to a waggon-wheel, is dragged along with the wheel, and is just as much there as ever, whatever progress may have been made.

The farmers are beginning to understand this, and to know that, with the exception of a portion of trouble they might have about their leases, they have no direct interest in keeping corn

at a monopoly price; for the simple reason, that it is the landlords, and not they, that take the difference. Some of them probably fall into a blunder, analogous to that of the Birmingham men on currency. The farmer perhaps says, What do I want but a high price; therefore let me have prices always raised by a famine. The Birmingham man says, What do I want but bank-notes in my pocket; therefore make me plenty of bank-notes. Neither of them sees that his scheme is let off through a simple hole he did not look for; the one because his expected gains are taken by the landlord, and the other because his increased bank-notes do no more for anybody than the old, except that the issuer pockets what he gets for them. If both are silly, the farmer is not sillier than the man of brass.

As I have before had the satisfaction of endeavouring to bring to notice in your journal,—any substantial interest the farmers ever had in the Corn Laws appears to reduce itself to the increased employment for farmers which may have been created at the time of imposing those laws, and conversely the diminished employment which might be the consequence of their removal. On which the questions that arise for them are, Is it certain that the quantity of farming business would be diminished, though a good deal of it might change forms?—and next, Are not the farmers at this moment suffering from the crowded state of their own and all other branches of industry consequent on the limitation of commerce, to an extent which would be cheaply removed at the expense of all they might finally lose in the way of employment, through a gradual removal of the monopoly of the landlords?

London, 17 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the True Scotsman.

No. IX.

PROGRESS OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CHARTER.—CHECK FROM SEPTENNIAL PARLIAMENTS.

SIR,—I cannot avoid communicating my impression, that the demand for progress in the principles of the People's Charter, is substantially advancing. We have got over some of our misadventures, and there has been time for those who did not join at first, to reflect upon their interest in doing it now. Considerable changes have taken place too in the

standing of other parties in the community. The Whigs have committed a sort of *felo de se;* and though they may long hold office by a compact to do the work of the Tories better than the Tories can themselves, whatever honest men there are among them must appear, when they do appear, under a new form and name. Things are coming back much nearer than they were, to the state of things when the Charter was first announced. It was not the invention of fools, or desperadoes, or robbers. No man that was concerned in it, wanted anything out of his neighbour's purse, or had the smallest desire to lay an embargo on his liberty or his business for any sinister purposes of his own. They were something as near the opposite of a conclave of landlords, turning the key upon every man who did not swear to an interest like their own and then legislating for the filling of their pockets, as language could convey. Their course was not long smooth; for in the language of scripture, Satan hindered. The enemy came down, and sowed tares, in the shape of counsels to try the effects of violence, where it might have been supposed the first inference of reasoning men would have been, that violence could only end in depression. Other violences, short of appeals to arms, alienated great masses of those who ought to have coalesced. But the good that was in the thing, survived through all; and because it was the only point where there was truth and universal honesty, it will still be what men measure from in their approaches to the right.

Instead of falling off from it, it is evident that men are gathering about it. All the assemblages formed for demanding any alteration in the things that are, may be taken as so many homages paid to the central principle about which they move. That justice should all come at once, is as unlikely as that sickness or crime should all cease at once; but it is a great thing to have set up a standard to which men's eyes shall be directed as a guide.

Observe the arguments which take place now, in the press and elsewhere. No man applies himself to prove that an alteration is wrong, but only that it should not go so far as the Charter would demand. The Charter has frightened down the denial that alteration is wanted; the battle now is only for saving some scrubby difference, which shall leave something to be done another time.

It is very useful to observe by the way, how it is that the progress of amendment is impeded by the existing abuses. For example, if there was any circulation between the House of Commons and the public by the members sitting for

short periods, the demand for the reforms specified in the Charter would be from time to time finding their way into that assembly. But the provision made by the corruptionists is, that nothing of that kind shall come for seven years. The assembly is to be seven years (which is a term bearing a high proportion to the active life of man) behind the wants and wishes of the community. When you have wanted and wished for seven years, there shall be a chance that you may begin to have a hearing if you can get it. Nothing was ever more clearly a provision for keeping you unheard. And when the time comes for appointing, there is to be no selection, no comparison. The people are to run races in the dark, and as far as possible, drunk; and out of this is to come the capability of consulting for your interest and the disappointment of your enemies.

When such advances have been made as have taken place, in discovering the connexion between modes of government and their consequences, it would be unreasonable to quarrel with there not being more. The turn of the people of England at present is as distinctly towards the obtaining of government in their own interest and not in the interest of somebody else, as it was in any period of their history that can be specified; and their final success is consequently as little to be doubted. To know, as the means of uniting in what is right, is what we are all pursuing. The errors and crimes of governments all favour this object. For example, the attempt to involve the community in ignominious wars, as the means of distracting its attention from reforms at home, has only given an impulse to the efforts in the contrary direction. The scorn into which the class of legislators who boast themselves as "good reformers" has fallen through the compact it has visibly made to allow of every kind of misgovernment upon conditions, has created a demand for better instruments, which will break out powerfully when the season arrives. If there is as much wisdom in the constituencies as makes a child take its fingers out of the fire, to have been one of the "good reformers" who supported the Holy Alliance Whigs, will assuredly be a passport to rejection upon opportunity. In the meantime I take occasion to repeat my endeavour to impress, the formidable way in which this single portion of the impositions which weigh upon us, the legislating by feelings seven years old, keeps down and hinders the introduction of the people's voice into what is denominated the people's house.

Let us then keep together, and endeavour to take the ways

that shall bring more about us, instead of causing others to leave us. We do not want to be men prating in corners, but men thinking and acting in numbers sufficient to make our way into the guidance of our own concerns. Our business has long enough been managed to please others, and we now want to have a little experience of managing it to please ourselves.

London, 16 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Bolton Free Press.

No. XII.

HOW DOES THE GERMAN MANUFACTURER UNDERSELL THE ENGLISH?—OUR MEN OF BUSINESS NEGLECT THE "MAIN CHANCE."

SIR,—I was to endeavour to show in what precise way the monopoly of food at home, prevents a Birmingham or Bolton manufacturer from competing with the foreigner.

Suppose then, that the Englishman is exposed to the competition of the German, in the American market, where the returns shall be proffered in cotton. And for simplicity, let the English and German manufacturer be on an equal footing in respect of knowledge, machinery, capital, and the means of obtaining raw material; and further, let the food to be given to the operatives in the two countries be exactly the same.

The object of the food monopoly in England, is to increase the quantity of everything else which shall be exchanged for an assigned quantity of food; and it is increased accordingly. But in Germany there is no such monopoly; therefore, *cæteris paribus*, a smaller quantity of the cotton of America will purchase or replace the peck of wheat which is the food of the operative, in Germany than in England. Let the difference in this quantity of cotton then, in some particular instance be equal to a pound; and it follows that the Englishman must demand for his goods a pound of cotton more from the American, than the German will. In other words, the German will undersell him by that pound; for the simple reason that a pound less will do just as well for him, as the greater quantity for the Englishman.

A statement lately received at Nottingham, purports that the German hosiers can afford their goods in America for two-thirds the money prices of the English. Which means that after the German has laid out his two dollars in American

produce to carry home, and the Englishman his three, the two dollars' worth of produce are as good to the German when he gets it home, as the three to the Englishman. The reason of which has just been pointed out, arising from some such fact, as that where one pound of cotton must be given for the German operative's peck of wheat, two must be given for the Englishman's; which, compounded with the other expenses, may easily produce the proportion on the whole of two to three.

If the Nottingham manufacturer is on one hand more favourably situated than the German in respect of knowledge, machinery, capital, and the means of obtaining the raw material; and if on the other, he is bound to provide the operative with a larger quantity of food, or of better quality, than the German; then those two opposite causes must be set off against each other. And as nobody imagines the English operative is so much better fed than the German as to balance all the advantage of English knowledge, machinery, and capital, the result is only to show how the best advantages of nature and art may be set at defiance by a monopoly of food.

In all this it has been endeavoured to prevent deception from the introduction of currency, by not introducing it at all. In any given country, all that currency does is to act as the instrument of exchange, or effect the barter between commodities of different kinds in that country, in a way very analogous to what may be done by an exchange of cheques at a receiving-house.

In all this, it is curious to remark the total absence of anything like dependence on the reduction of wages. It is to be presumed that the manufacturing capitalist would make gain by the reduction of wages under the corn laws if he could; and that if he does not, it is because he cannot. In what way then is the removal of the corn laws to enable him to gain by the reduction of wages when he could not do it before; and what proof or likelihood is there that the gain is to be through a reduction of wages, when there is a clear way for its being done by something else, to wit, the reduction of the quantity out of the goods imported which must be applied to paying the monopolist for the operative's food? The whole is clearly only a "currency" fallacy, and it is difficult to imagine the operative falling into it but by choice. He has some other object in view, before he surrenders to such a raw and unlikely reason, as that because the master wishes to compete, *therefore* he can have no means of doing it but by the reduction of wages.

It is impossible to restrain the expression of belief, that either men of business look into their "matters" very badly, or that they have not begun to look at these questions as matters of business at all. With which indirect commendation to their better care and judgment, I beg leave to wind up the present subject.

London, 24 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Dundee Chronicle.

No. V.

OBSEQUIES OF THE EMPEROR.—LESSON TO THE BRITISH PEOPLE.

SIR,—At a time when attention is attracted to the obsequies of the late Emperor of the French, it may not be without its use to make a brief retrospect with a view to application to the present times.

When the allies (not as yet Holy) with England as their prompter and payer, were invading France for the purpose of putting down the movements for popular freedom there and in England, Napoleon Bonaparte was a well-grown schoolboy, like myriads who may be existing at the present hour, dreaming night and day of the delight it would be to help to point a four-pounder against the armies of the invaders. Half-a-dozen years saw the forces of the coalition (would that such fate always attended the like) dispersed and driven back, and himself the general of the most marked of the victorious armies. The inventor of a new theory of war, as Copernicus was of astronomy, he speedily became the chief of the French government, and repaid the attacks upon his country by a succession of hostile visits to the capitals of her enemies. It is a rough kind of justice, but it is all the constitution of things in this world has provided, that national abuse of power shall end in national punishment. If Britain's share up to the present time was her rotten boroughs and her debt, it is by no means certain that she has yet seen the end.

But having been gloriously successful for justice, he began to fight for what governments call policy. And here, though his operations were by no means to be ranked with the flagitious movements of Britain in the East, and were purity itself compared with her late disgraces in that quarter, they gradually lowered him and his country in the affections of the world. Instead of a prop of popular principles, France was viewed as an overwhelming power leading unwilling

armies of foreigners to serve her interests against their own. She became hated as the general enemy; though still feared and served, as Britain is among the powers of Asia. At last a great operation failed; and Frenchmen were hunted back to their capital, as Englishmen will some time be on the like event, if the civil wisdom of the people does not wrest the power of military abuse out of the hands of insane and dishonest administrators.

The difficulties in the way of doing this, are many. In the first place, if the people had all power in their hands, it is by no means clear that they would be honest. Great numbers of them are inclined to be cut-throats as their fathers were. In one sense, their fathers may be to blame. They have been educated in the belief that there was no national morality,—that the world was a field of plunder, in which he was most glorious who took most,—that in fact to take nothing was a sign of baseness and chicken-heartedness which could not be looked over. Religious instruction came in aid; many of us were brought up in the persuasion, that we were God's peculiar people, and that to smite the Amalekites in the shape of any foreign nation that could be found, was doing God service. Hypocrites and knaves were always at our elbow, ready to intimate that every foul act of slaughter was a portion of some great "scheme of Providence;" just as the missionaries who are at the head of the piratical invasion of China, see in all "the hand of God" leading them to make establishments in the land of the heathen. It is probable that Burke and Hare* would be found to have had glimmerings, of the same kind of instrumentality for good. But under such training for evil, it is no wonder if the masses go wrong. And though light has fallen on many, there may be doubt whether a majority are not still ready to toss up their caps for any kind of murders and villainy their betters might recommend to them.

Another great difficulty is, that the men who have put themselves forward and in fact occupied the situation of "reformers," are notoriously and peculiarly unsound. When the Chinese ignominy was solemnly debated, these men stamped it on us and our posterity by their deliberate votes, though they had the example in many of the Tories, of the possibility of preserving the feelings of integrity and honour

* Burke and Hare were two men hanged for procuring subjects for the dissecting-room by suffocating passengers at night with a pitch-plaster. Hence to "burke" became a popular, and even parliamentary phrase, for the clandestine extinction of a measure.

in despite of a course of politics habitually illiberal. There is not a public meeting pretended for reform, at which some of these men do not trumpet their shame, and avow their readiness to support any quantum of plunder or of massacre which their friends in office may devise.

The hope then is in such honesty as may be found or cultivated among the people. Their habits are not personally in favour of violence and wrong. They have never experienced advantage from such courses, but on the contrary have found themselves invariably left to pay the expense and find the suffering. A great lesson is going on before their eyes, of the sources of a nation's strength, and weakness too. If Napoleon, with so many claims to the respect of men and nations, was finally unsuccessful and given over into the power of his enemies, what chance is there for our British rulers, if they are allowed to compass the hatred of the world, with none of the attachment?

London, 22 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XXXIX.

THE CHINESE WAR.—BROTHER GUTZLAFF'S LOVE FOR OPIUM AND SOULS.—SCRIPTURE COMMENDATION OF REBELLION.

SIR,—In commenting upon the disgraceful news from China, it will be enough to remark on the extreme and puerile impolicy, of a nation making some pretensions to honesty and love of its own privileges, encouraging and paying for the indulgence of that rampant spirit of violence, which it would so grievously writhe under if exercised upon itself.

Is it not plain that in all this, we are only paying for a rod for our own backs? That it wants nothing but the will of some other minister, under some other pretended reforming parliament, to turn all these sufferings upon ourselves as fast as the occasion may arise? There would be nothing a whit more unreasonable, in setting a drunken soldiery upon Leeds or Birmingham in consequence of their resistance to the prohibition of foreign corn, than in doing the same to a Chinese town on the ground of its resistance to the introduction of foreign opium. The scoundrelism would only be the same; and those who would do the one, would do the other. It may

not be so very long, before our countrymen at large have lively proof, that those who through fear, idleness, or fellow-feeling, offer their bodies and purses to be the tools of robbers and cut-throats as was done through their representatives the so-styled "reformers" in parliament, are likely in the course of Providence, to have themselves some taste of the sharp practice which they introduce.

What says history? Has there been any people on record, which gave itself up to piratical brutalities under the name of conquest, and has not expiated it by a long course of suffering to itself, ending in being put down by the natural consequences of its offences? At this moment England is engaged all over the world, in infamies revolting to a gentleman and to an honest man, to say nothing of the pretensions to higher characters occasionally assumed. The missionary Gutzlaff is found heading a piratical invasion of the Chinese territory for the love of opium and souls; and the Methodists in the South Seas engage the captain of a ship of war, which it seems is a thing at all calls for anything discreditable all the world over, to attack the "heathen" at the head of the "marines and converted natives," for the enormity of occupying their own fort in their own land. To such basenesses must we bend and bow, till somebody will help us.

What a figure shall we make in history, and in the eyes of posterity! Not that either will honour individuals with notice; but what an idea will be presented of the great putrescent mass,—the dishonoured and dishonourable crowd, who allowed themselves to be trampled into assassins by deputy, to fill the purses of a few scores of knavish traders in the metropolis, by the intervention of paying the amount ten times over. Joseph Sturge may perhaps stand out, in the manner of one sound orange in a cask-full. But the professors of religion in the main, will be found with brother Gutzlaff; there is hardly any of them that would not batter his converts with thirty-two pounders, for pay and provent.

I only find one word objectionable in Joseph Sturge's letter of the 9th of 12th month present. Why, in speaking of Texas, did he insert "rebellion"? In the first place, there *was* no rebellion; it was an invasion of reprobates for plunder. In the second, rebellion is not a crime *per se*, and consequently not to be introduced as such into a list. In proof of this, I appeal to an authority which will be satisfactory to the author of the letter, and doubtless to many others to whom it may arrive. Rebellion is spoken of with high commendation in the scripture, which is part and parcel of the law of our land.

Prosperity in rebellion is mentioned as the mark and seal of the immediate presence and assistance of the Deity. "And the Lord was with him [Hezekiah]; and he prospered whithersoever he went forth: and he rebelled against the king of Assyria, and served him not." 2 Kings, xviii. 7. A court preacher it may be surmised would take our friend to task, for his rash insertion of a term so honoured with divine approval.

Saving this, which is but a peccadillo from a theologian who has not had the advantage of being educated in the divine-procession Church, the letter in question will be very likely to stand out, as a point from which to measure the difference between what the professions of the religious would demand of them, and what the mass of our "brother Gutzlaffs" have any inclination to support.

London, 16 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leicestershire Mercury.

No. X.

CASE OF THE TURKISH FRIGATE.—NECESSITY FOR KEEPING UP THE PUBLIC WEALTH.

SIR,—Among the results of the late operations in the East, appears to have been a striking and important experiment in political economy, which I find referred to in your pages.

The commander of a Turkish frigate, with fourteen hundred prisoners besides his crew, applied himself to the creation of general and particular wealth upon the voyage. For this purpose, he saw the importance of keeping up the value of the staple articles of life; he therefore sold the water to the highest bidder. And "though at no period of the voyage was the ship more than twelve hours' sail from a port where it would have been procured in abundance," he prudently abstained from allowing any communication; as knowing the reduction of wages which must be the consequence, and being conscious he had no convenience for issuing a large paper currency, which would have remedied the evil. And in this, he persevered to the end; though four hundred of his passengers sank under their ignorant impatience of the process.

The report from the oriental newspaper quoted, goes on to say, that this captain is to be tried for his life, and that there is no doubt he will be beheaded at Topkhane (the Turkish

Woolwich) or hanged at the Arsenal. Such is the brutal ignorance of oriental governments.

Now I am going to take up the cause of this captain; and to express my hope that, for precedent's sake, the Turks will do nothing rash, and particularly nothing that must involve the British government in the necessity of remonstrance.

I say, I cannot conceive, that the British government can allow this unfortunate officer to come to harm, in sight of a British fleet, and under the eyes of their ambassador, without finding themselves called upon by all their previously-formed habits and instincts, to display the strongest interest in his behalf.

For what was it the man was accused of? He did what he would with his own, or what he considered his own. Knowing that there was no readier way of dividing a little than by putting it up to auction, he sold the water to the highest bidder. If there was any misery consequent to individuals, it was no part of his intention to create this; his object was the general wealth. He knew perfectly the addition of value he was going to make to what would otherwise have been without it, and the ruin that would have ensued to many individuals from an alteration in the practice. He saw, for instance, the case of those who had given "three pounds sterling for a small barrel," and who instead of being able to circulate and divide it at a corresponding rate, would have found themselves reduced to poverty by the ship's being brought to moorings under a pump. He calculated the number of industrious persons who must be employed in the trade, and the activity which must have been given to industry at large. He knew there must be men on board, practising mechanic arts, as for instance cutting tobacco-stoppers, and disposing of them for water in return; and he recollected the enormous interest these men had in what might be called the home or "inboard" trade, compared with any external trade, of which they in fact had none at all. Was he to destroy all this, because he had a port within twelve hours' sail where water could be got? On the contrary, was it not his bounden duty, for that very reason to keep clear of those ports, to shut out communication with them, as being of all things that on which the welfare and riches of his passengers were most dependent?

I will bet any credit I may have for common sense, that if the case of this unfortunate officer were only properly brought before parliament at its meeting, two-thirds of the House of Commons would rise up in his behalf. Lord Melbourne

would declare the man must be mad who could have thought of advising him to do anything else; and Lord John Russell would avow that he was always conscious of the importance of giving a preponderance to a water-selling interest. If Mr. Wakley were to want to hold a coroner's jury upon the casualties, and ask questions about the nearness of the ports, —would he not be told directly, that they were not nearer than Boulogne or Hamburgh are to England, and that it would be as reasonable to expect the English food-selling interest to allow ships to go to Boulogne or Hamburgh for corn because they were within twelve hours' sail, as the Turkish water-seller to put himself out of his way for an equally foolish purpose? And for the deaths, what are four hundred? Look at the number here, who fall yearly before the necessity of keeping up the public wealth by maintaining the price of corn; and ask whether any sensible man can be found to incur the prime minister's anathema, by suggesting it should be otherwise. Patriotism is the virtue of virtues, afloat or ashore; and patriotism consists in dying for the country as the governors shall direct.

On the whole, Sir, let me hope, that the opportunity of "reading a moral lesson" will not be lost on parliament; and particularly that the captain of this frigate will receive from his brother philosophers in the House of Commons the patronage which he deserves.

London, 23 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Manchester Advertiser.

No. XII.

"Tory-Radicals;" the Inventors of the Term have had their Way.

Sir,—It was considered a great joke against some of us, to call us "Tory-Radicals;" which meant Radicals who cared no more for one set of Tories than for another. The namers have had their way, and every man sees what it is they have brought us to. The bustle now is with the Whig and Tory Conservatives, each anxious in his way to stop the progress of reform, and perfectly willing upon occasion, to join for compassing their end.

What was your last gathering at Manchester, but a display on the part of the Whig Conservatives, of what they were de-

termined to do and leave undone? Their one object amounted to keeping things as they are, under the direction of the ministry which has declared against more Reform. Many a scheme for national felicity, from paper money upwards, spread its light wings and ventured a partial flight; but all subordinate to the grand necessity for supporting the ministers who do nothing or worse.

What is the use of telling the people that no reform was ever got without being "wrenched," when the great aim of the speakers is to assist in preventing anything like a wrench? Which of the orators at your gathering is there, whom anything would induce to do anything but talk, and talk in support of the ministers who will do nothing without wrenching, and not against them? For example, will any of them lift up their voice against our ignominious wars? A direct declaration of approbation on the contrary will be volunteered. Believe me, these are only meetings anxious to impress on ministers, the length and breadth of the support on which they may calculate in any extent of evil-doing.

They pretend to desire freedom of trade; and then engage their support to a ministry whose representative in the House of Commons says he always thought the preponderance of the landed interest essential, and in the House of Lords, that he should think anybody mad who should act on the contrary opinion. These men have other objects. Their real ones are not their avowed. As the Romans under the empire contested for colours in their games, so these are contending for a party the only merit of which is that it is *theirs;* and their professions of zeal for other objects are false and superficial, or at the best entirely subordinate to the preservation of their own party in power. The proof of this is, that they use no means. They point to no method, by which Lord John Russell shall be made to see the error of his ways, or Lord Melbourne to come to a better conclusion touching the limits which divide insanity from common sense. Like the planters who turned round on the Slave-Trade Abolitionists, and told them it was all their fault the Abolition did not take place before; so Lords Melbourne and Russell will declare that their friends at Manchester never hinted dislike, or never in a way they took to be meant for serious. And the fact is, they do not dislike; they are very well as they are. The rank and file may dislike; but the leaders do not intend on that account to have a ministerial interview the less.

A few brief questions, if answered, might throw light on the sincerity of these professors. Have they any promise from

ministers to do anything for the interests of the public in return for their support? Or have they the slightest reason for believing the ministers will do anything without? Can they point to one thing the ministers are to do or not to do, as the condition for keeping them in? Will the ministers extend the franchise, or shorten the duration of parliaments? Will they pay for the wars which they have entered into by stealth and against the consent of parliament; or will they wait till it is forced from them by the processes prepared against defaulters? When a festival of congratulation to a deserving citizen, is turned into a parade of political preparations and intentions, it is immediately opened to all questions connected with the change.

I observe one of the chief speakers of the assembly lays the blame on the too great humanity of ministers towards vanquished enemies. Many will be of opinion on the other side, that they never either vanquished anybody, or gave quarter to them afterwards. The real story, this section will maintain, is that they went over to the enemy; that they never intended to hurt him, beyond the damage that might ensue from the loss of place; and that at this moment they are undergoing a distinct round of the same enemy's applause, for the effective way in which they have supported the hostile objects, and given promise of more hereafter.

London, 24 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Nottingham Review.

No. X.

PROGRESS OF MACHINERY.—NATURE GAVE ANIMALS A TAIL, AND MAN CUTS IT OFF.

SIR,—Finding the attention of some of your correspondents directed to the sufferings attending the progress of machinery, I cannot lose the opportunity of commenting on the necessity there is for misery deep and large, when the working classes or important portions of them, quietly follow leaders who advise them to resist the introduction of what was manifestly meant for nature's remedy. If the inhabitants of the polar regions were found complaining of cold and refusing to use the furs which the same climate had provided, —or of darkness, and opposing the introduction of oil from

the fish the produce of the sea,—it would only be an image of the mal-reasoning which has seized on many of the operatives.

When an improvement is made in machinery, the community on the whole gains by it, just as an individual gains by an invention by which he can do two hours' work in one. There is therefore as little probability that communities on the whole should ever reject machinery, as that individuals should. But there is a new circumstance where the machinery is applied to distinct trades, and not to the labour of an individual for his own consumption; which is, that a loss falls on one set of men, and the gains on many others, making up the balance of gain on the whole which has been mentioned.

Now as it was nature's will and intention that a horse should have a tail to drive away the flies from his tenderest parts, till man in his cruelty and absurdity cuts it off and dooms him to a life of unnecessary torment,—so it was nature's original design and plan, that at the same time that machinery effected advantages to the whole community where it was employed, the damage done to individuals should be counteracted, if not entirely yet to a very great and effectual extent, by another provision for that end prepared. It did not say there should be no biting of flies at all; but it said there should be a tail which should be competent at all events to keep them within endurable limits. And this tail it is, which the working classes or some of them, under the advice of their good friends and leaders, have been induced to insist on being cut off.

The remedy of nature's appending was simply this;—that as fast as machinery made easier the production of any kind of manufactured goods, just so fast it increased the facility with which that kind of goods could be employed in foreign commerce if it were free. If stockings by any advance in machinery could be made at half the cost they were before, there was an opening by the same fact for selling, if not a double quantity, to a certainty a greatly increased quantity, to foreigners for such of their produce as was wanted here, and particularly for food. The tail might not be an all-perfect instrument; it might not amount to an annihilation of the evil it was intended to act against; but it was a most good and useful tail, and foolish indeed were the poor sufferers, who so far as they had anything to say to it, allowed the farrier to be sent for, to denude their hind quarters of the defence nature had designed for them.

But if the mass and main body of the trade we want to have with foreigners is put down by law, it is not difficult to see how the effect of nature's intended remedy is at all events cut short. It may not amount to that close kind of dock which used to be exemplified in those unhappy servants of the public the troop-horses, and which the French, from the name of the English commander who authorized it, still denominate a "Cadogan." But it is that melancholy mutilation of which nine in ten of our much-abused beasts afford examples, where a useful member is reduced to a nearly useless excrescence, to please the booby that rides behind.

And there is yet another mode in which misery is kept up where nature intended to prevent it. In so far as the improvement of machinery extends to various classes of manufactures, the effect on the operatives at large is not the sum but the difference. For instance, no man that is not a stockinger, complains of the cheapening of stockings by machinery; on the contrary, he enjoys the cheaper wear. And in the same way the stockinger does not complain that the trade of coachmen is destroyed by railroads, or lament that he can go for six-pence as far as he used for a crown. Every man in his own case, solaces himself with machinery when he can. But the facility with which those who are from time to time thrown out of employment by machinery, can be taken up in other ways, must depend on the liveliness of trade in general, and this again on keeping open the trade with the world at large. The cry of the landowners is to give up the trade with the world at large, and confine ourselves to trade with the thieves at home; and this is what we are at this moment forced to submit to. Hence the ways and means for taking up those from time to time thrown out of employ, are purposely cut down. It is of no use pretending to ask whether they would ever all be taken up or not, or whether there may possibly be some who can never be made to turn themselves to anything else. The question is, whether the general process would go on faster when trade was free or when it is not.

London, 23 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Perth Chronicle.

No. II.

CHINESE WAR.—ARGUMENT WITH THE QUAKERS.

SIR,—On looking into your paper of the 17th, I am glad to find your sentiments on war according so closely with my own. At the same time let it be remembered, that I do not protest against war where it may be necessary; I protest against *shabby* war, against *unjust* war, against *discreditable* war, against war which is not only *needless* but in which the real need would be, that the beginners and authors should be hanged,—in short, against *Whig* war, or such war as the Whigs are making.

And here I cannot resist the temptation to try a fall with our friends the Quakers; who, though they are undeniably at the head of every good deed that is doing in the world, yet must sometimes feel their confidence shaken, in their tenet that a nation might do without war if it would only all be Quakers.

Now look at the Chinese; who in some respects are not unlike a Quaker community. They make war with nobody, kill nobody, blow up nobody; they are formal, grave, and harmless, living much by the rule of the elders and the custom of friends. They are much given to trade; but they prefer the quiet paddling from province to province, to the gaudier risks of commerce in foreign goods for which they feel no great anxiety. In some of these points they may be right and in others wrong; but on the whole there is certainly something Quakerish about them.

If then our own country, trusting to the moderation of its desires like the Chinese, should determine to adopt the Quaker plan of eschewing all preparations for defence,—see by the example of China, what the fate would be to which we should be exposed.

The first country in which the robbers were uppermost, whatever masses of honest men there might or might not be underneath, would have nothing to do but land upon our shores, burn our shipping, destroy our towns, set their drunken soldiery upon our women and our families, and commit every abomination by which a country can be defiled which falls into the hands of felons too strong to be taken by the constable. And what could we do? If we should seize some

of the assailants on opportunity by the civil power, and cause them to be brought to punishment as incendiaries and cut-throats, we should only increase the violence of the rest, so long as they consider themselves likely to be superior in the end. There is no use in offending housebreakers after they have got possession of the house; the only reasonable practice is to be prepared to keep them out.

And there is no use in saying, that if we were quiet and peaceable, other nations would let us alone. How do we know what villains may get to the top of other nations, or how far other nations may carry their submission to their profligates and to their thieves? An army of foreigners might come, and insist upon our eating poison and paying for it. You say nothing so rascally was ever heard of in the world's history. I say, it is nothing but what might happen if room was left for it; and therefore I am not for trusting to those who would leave our well-being at the mercy of the good feeling of anybody in the world. Perhaps you look at the map and say, Where is the people from whom any such chances could be apprehended? Would the French, would the Germans, and so on, ever disgrace themselves by entering into such a plan, or allow any government to make them pay for it? I cannot tell; but I would not trust them; there is no saying. I would keep a moderate power in our own hands; and if nobody tries to make us eat poison and pay for it, so much the better after all.

Is not the true theory of a national military force, something of this kind? As individuals walk the streets in safety through the consciousness of the ill-disposed that there is nobody who cannot make some defence, or get somebody to make it for him,—so national forces on all sides are a sort of guarantee, that no injustice can be attempted by one nation against another, without incurring an assured quantity of loss and suffering to the aggressor, so that on the whole, aggression had better be let alone?

It is true that the operation of this principle depends on governments getting *into* the hands of those who are to pay for the mischief done, and *out of* the hands of those who are to make a separate trade of the mischief. Which is not more than the progress of political improvement may at some time accomplish.

The French have a proverb which says, "The better is often the enemy of the good." I wish therefore we could postpone our aspirations after the time when men shall learn war no more, and instead of wanting to demolish our estab-

lishments at Woolwich and at Plymouth, try if we cannot compass a government that shall be obliged to confine them to honest purposes.

London, 28 *Dec.* 1840.

No. XI.

To the Editors of the Sheffield Iris.

PEACE AND EQUAL RIGHTS TO ALL NATIONS.—CONDUCT OF THE BRITISH IN INDIA AND CHINA.

SIRS,—The *Independent* has answered my last, by saying that it requires no answer. It would appear therefore, that I may be quit of further rejoinder if preferred.

The dispute, however, remains as good a one as ever. And the ground of it is simply here. There are some of us who say, we will not risk the public welfare on any system of tyranny or piracy, however promising or however seductive. We say we are for peace, and equal rights to all men and all nations. We know no instance of a nation going about to support itself by demanding a supremacy over others, which has not in the end been most unpleasantly put down. We see safety for nations, as for individuals, only in mutual interests, mutual courtesies; and we are particularly scandalized at the rude and wanton breaches both of duties and courtesies, which we have of late been forced to swallow, with every prospect of continuance till the insolence works its own cure.

To show that you are not solitary in being the mouth-piece of such principles, I subjoin an extract just received from a southern Journal, whose seat is in an agricultural district, thickly planted with government and conservative interests, and within the whiff and wind of the establishments whose trade is war; in short, a situation as different from your own as it is easy to devise.

'A friendly correspondent has reminded us that our apprehension of some national calamity in consequence of the wanton and unnecessary slaughter of the Egyptians is quite unfounded, and suggests that our ships may blow up and batter down every powder-magazine and fort in the world, and destroy half the earth's inhabitants, without the slightest fear of retribution; so long as the act is conducted according to the so-called law of nations, the conventionalities of diplomatic etiquette, and that matters are managed cleverly at home!'

'We confess that our respected correspondent's doctrine appears plausible, but we do not think it sound. We are no fatalists, nor do we anticipate any special dispensation in reference to this subject, but we judge from the relations of cause and effect. When an individual commits a crime, in addition to the desire of vengeance of those whom he has injured, the moral force of the world is generally against him, and seldom fails to visit him with those apparently fortuitous circumstances of mortification and calamity, which so frequently are seen to quell men of the proudest and most unquailing spirit. An individual may by some combination of fortunate events, by great craftiness, or by death, escape these mortifications. But a nation never dies, and national wrongs and antipathies are the last to seek oblivion. The intolerable arrogance of a powerful nation, in the mere wantonness of its strength, volunteering to place a limit to the self-advancement and the self-emancipation of the subjects of another state; carrying murderous desolation to their peaceful hearths; mingling man, woman, child, and beast, in one indiscriminate and revolting carnage; can scarcely be viewed by the people of any nation of the earth, without a secret feeling of insecurity if such outrage pass unredressed, and an intense, albeit perhaps latent hatred of the now mighty state which thus tyrannously uses its power like a giant. Readily and with fierce energy, will this hatred be developed, when the first step shall have been taken in such a power's abasement. The cruel wrongs of Poland cry aloud for vengeance, and, consequently, a war with Russia would be popular in almost every nation of Europe. England, the land of freedom, the refuge of the oppressed of all nations, the redresser of the slave, lends its hand to steady a tottering empire, based upon the loathsome principles of the bow-string and the mute! The barbarous and wretched descendants of the once-powerful race now bleed and writhe under the iron heel of the conqueror, incapable of resistance: but the lovers of liberty in all countries will remember the day when Great Britain's engines of destruction were turned against their Mahomedan brethren, and the time may not be far distant when this wanton act of tyranny will bring its retribution, in the inevitable visitation of the world's concentrated hate.' —*Maidstone Gazette*, 15 Dec. 1840.

Here lies the peril; and the case is well argued in the land of hops! Our rulers are making us odious and scandalous; a combination which nothing can finally resist. Instead of being viewed with affection as the prop of nations' independence, we are considered as the grand bully, ready everywhere to gain our ends by slaughter on the pretence of preventing future bloodshed. Whether we do or forbear, it is always to hinder bloodshed; pious men in China are lamenting over the non-destruction of Canton, "that great city," out of pure fear that they shall be obliged to kill more men, women, and children, in compassing their ends.

Considerations of this kind should have increased weight,

from the lesson at this moment going on within sight of our shores. Napoleon began well, but fell away into a distant resemblance of the conduct of our own government. Nothing he ever did, approached the general tyranny of the conduct of the English in India; and the Chinese monstrosity was a thing it would be in vain to seek to parallel with him or elsewhere. His movement upon Spain, which was the most unjustifiable of his acts, was an attempt to overturn a bad government, with the good wishes of perhaps a fifth part of its subjects; while the English in India overturn the better government, with the good wishes of nobody at all. With the power of the earth apparently at his command, Napoleon died in exile. We have nobody worth exiling; but if we set the power of the earth against us, we may see the play performed again, with the part of Hamlet omitted.

At present there is a kind of lull in men's apprehensions, in consequence of the belief that political events have come to something like a point. It is possible the stealthy ministers, like orchard-robbing boys, may be inclined to let things settle a little against Black Monday which approaches. But nobody should be too sure. There may be something coming, to which all of base and dishonourable hitherto shall be but a flea-bite. And there is the further chance, that mischief may not stop exactly where they bid it. Suppose, for example, the French people, after being abused and insulted with all the acuteness which Tory genius could muster under the wing of Whig encouragement, should chuse to have their mischief in their turn. Suppose they were to insist on destroying three or four towns, as why should they not, to prevent war,—putting to death a myriad or so of men, women, and children, out of *douce humanité* and a simple desire to forestall the necessity for hurting anybody,—imagine that such a fantasy should come on them or on their government, and what reason can be given why it should not have its way as well as yours? Some of us probably would bully and talk large, about punishing the aggressors. But suppose the punishment should take place in the persons of the original culprits. It would be better to put our ministers into a jolly-boat and drop them with the tide into the hands of Commissioner Lin, than to run the risk of all their mingled folly and malevolence might bring upon us if allowed to go on unchecked.

London, 19 *Dec.* 1840.

No. XI.

To the Editor of the Suffolk Chronicle.

HOW FARMERS ARE AFFECTED BY THE CORN LAWS.—MEN DO NOT SIT IN A BOG, FOR FEAR OF WHAT MAY HAPPEN IN GETTING OUT.

SIR,—Your contemporary of the *Ipswich Journal* in his paper of the 10th instant states his apprehension, that the manner in which the farmers' profits and the wages of labour would be affected by the repeal of the Corn Laws, has been quite lost sight of in the letters of your various correspondents. If this is so, there is nothing to be done but try to mend it now.

The way in which farmers' profits are affected by the existence of the Corn Laws, may in the first instance be stated to be much the same as the way in which the gains of foremen of manufactories would be affected by a bounty given on the importation of foreign corn, for the purpose of causing a greater quantity of corn to be bought with English manufactures. The case is one of which the agricultural interest may have experience some time or other, at all events to the extent of decent retribution; and there is little difficulty in comprehending the nature of the results. Or to aim at greater exactness still, the case of the manufacturing foremen corresponds more precisely to that of what are called farming-men; and to make a complete parallel to that of farmers who are capitalists, the instances should be taken, which though not numerous may be found, where a capitalist farms some principal instrument for his manufacturing production. But, both in the case of these and of foremen, it is clear that a bounty on foreign corn would have a tendency to increase the room for men of their vocation to employ themselves, and so far make them a better trade, at least for a time, and with livelier profits.

An advantage of the same kind it may be conceded the farmers would have by the imposition of the Corn Laws; on which it is tempting to remark, that it would be but fair that they and their manufacturing counterparts should take turn and turn about. If the farmers mean to say, it is a good thing for them, and therefore it shall be kept; they will find themselves mistaken, as many other men have been who thought to keep good things they had taken from the public.

But allowing the farmers to estimate this advantage in the first instance at its full magnitude, there remains the question of how much they are the better for it now, and whether the

fact is not that they are the worse. And if they are the worse, then comes the other question of whether they would not be better for going back again, even though the process of return should for a time be accompanied with an increase of damage. There is nothing absurd in this; a man gets into a bog, and the process of getting out is often vastly more troublesome than getting in. But he does not stay there the more for that; and so it may be here.

The farmers, like other men, multiply. In fact they multiply rather more. They have therefore long since bred up to the increased demand for farmers; and because that increase was limited and a thing not to be repeated or found over again in another place, they have bred not only up to it but past it. They know full well, that though there might be a flush of farmers' business twenty years ago in consequence of laying on the Corn Laws, the flush is all over now, because farmers have multiplied up to it. If the increase at that time held out in farmers' business was one fourth, they know that the consequence has been that there are now five farmers instead of four, and that the five are no better off than the four. They have bidden against one another for farms, till the rate of farming profits is not only not greater than it was to begin with, but till it is less.

And there is this new hopelessness about their condition. The general effect of the Corn Laws was to shut up the industry and population of the country upon a given quantity of food. Farmers therefore in the end are just as much shut up by this restriction as anybody else. If a farmer has five sons, he can only give one of them the succession to the farm. The farm must either be split among them, which will end in bringing them or their children to be farmers' labourers; or the four must be provided with other employment. But profitable employment everywhere else is blocked up like the farming trade, by the multitudes which are crowded into it. There is a struggle for a limited quantity of food, as in a ship short of provisions. There is no doubt therefore that the farmers' condition is bad; and that their only way to mend it, is through being temporarily worse. The man may be up to the middle, and before he gets out he may be up to the arms. But the fear of this does not make him sit still; the great necessity is to get out.

The case of the agricultural labourers and their wages, is very similar. The landlords say to them, "Allow us to make you breed against a limited quantity of food;" and they breed so accordingly. The necessary consequence of which is, that

the labourers multiply till they are glad to bid against one another for the lowest wages on which men can live, or if that is not the right word, can die; in other words till they give their services to the landlords for the smallest possible payment in return. And then the landlords terrify them with the representation, which, as seen above, is not without its truth, that if they try to make themselves better they must first be worse;—that if an end were ever put to the system which shuts them up, the result would be a diminution of the employment to which they have been bred;—and so the landlords think they have them in a trap, and they must go on for ever and ever, assisting to secure themselves in the bad for fear of worse.

The answer here is as before, that wise men do not sit in a bog, for fear of the wet they may contract in getting out. And, as in the example taken, the perils of what is to befall in getting out, are easily overrated. To sit still for ever, is to secure a miserable life and a short one; come what will of the struggle to escape, it "may be better, can't be worse." And there is no sound reason for believing, that the consequences of trying to escape must necessarily be so bad at all. There is always one way of softening the matter, which the landlords say very little about; and that is, to make the alteration gradually. The landlords themselves do not know, how much easier the return to honesty when it is forced upon them, may be than they expected. Nobody wants to make the thing worse for them than can be helped; but the return to honesty, men must and will have, and probably a little something in the way of retribution too.

London, 23 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the True Scotsman.

No. X.

Cause of the Love of France for Napoleon.

Sir,—It may be gathered from the contents of your Journal, that your readers are by no means indifferent to the spectacle displayed in France in consequence of the arrival of the remains of the Emperor, to rest, as was his desire, on the banks of the Seine. Upon which I would ask, what personage there has been in any history, whose funeral ceremonies twenty years

after his death, would have produced a similar excitement; and what is the cause of the peculiarity in the present case.

The only individual in English history whose fame in his own land could be produced as bearing any resemblance to that of the Emperor in France, is Cromwell; but after the principles of his glorious government had been virtually acknowledged at the Revolution, his bones remained where the "hyæna" royalists had left them, and no public movement restored them to their place among those of the sovereigns of the country. The interval of time was greater; yet not so great but that numbers must have lived who had followed England's "chief of men" to victory, and staked their lives and fortunes on the day. But the interest in Cromwell was never so homely nor so close as in Napoleon. He represented a principle in religion and government, and the curious on those subjects were grateful to him for its success. But he did not see a whole generation educated to look up to him, as the living banner of their victory over past oppression, and their security against its return.

What then made the difference between Napoleon's name and others? Why is it, that if the ruggedest of your mountaineers, brought up in hostile ranks, had been present at the scene, he would have been unable to resist the infection of the hour? It was simply this,—Napoleon raised a "slave class," nine-tenths of France, into equality with the rest; and for this they loved him. He decimated their children, taxed their means of life, for foreign wars; but still they loved him. The homestead, stood the birth-place of men with equal rights; and though the rights were small, the equality was much. Every man who returned from the wars, was a living evidence, that "the cold shade of aristocracy" had been destroyed. If he had not been fortunate himself, he was acquainted with those who had, and knew it was not birth which had hindered his success.

It is this principle, which France is now uniting to honour. Adverse politicians are obliged to bow before it, and affect attachment if they have it not. If a malignant government had not contrived to interpose the Egyptian outrage, it is highly probable that the feeling would have extended itself to Britain, and with useful consequences. For have we no "slave class," whose gratitude would be as reasonable, for any deliverance which Providence should vouchsafe?

The lesson from all this is, that let the facts be disguised as they may by national or political prejudices, to serve the interests of the masses of the people is what gives lasting

fame and permanent remembrance. Honour then, to all who have raised a "slave class" in time past, or shall do it hereafter!

London, 23 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Bolton Free Press.

No. XIII.

The Anti-Corn-Law Movement in existence before the Charter Movement.

Sir,—Proceedings reported in your Journal, invite to an examination of the policy pursued by the working classes under the name of Chartism.

The framers and original promoters of the Charter, assuredly included no provision for stopping all other political movements till the Charter was made law. They knew they were making a statement of the wants and wishes of the *weakest* part of the community, and who only wanted and wished because they were so. The desires too were not so unreasonable, or so incompatible with the well-being of the rest of the community, but that there was good hope of seeing them one day realized. But they would have thought it as rational to draw up a statement of the wishes of the oppressed labourers in the West Indies, setting forth their desires to abolish the cartwhip and be admitted to elect deputies of their own class to the colonial assemblies, and then have backed it by a resolution that no man should carry any other measure as long as the petitioners could hinder it.

At the time when the Charter was reduced to form, another great movement was already to some extent in possession of the public mind. It was a movement aimed at the heart, or to be less figurative the stomach, of the injustice of the aristocratic classes; directed in fact to preventing them from limiting the possible reward of a nation's industry to the produce of their acres. If the zeal in this movement was more extensive among what are called the middle classes than among the operatives, it was only in proportion to their greater opportunities for examining the action of the system. But the agitation among the working classes had given the alarm to the interested in the corn laws; and like wise men, they came forward to try to take possession of the

movement. Some of lordly rank had the genius to be among the foremost; and they made the impression which in this country is always the practical consequence of such interference, however loud the protests against submission to such influence. Other individuals of mark, who from previous causes had in one department or other been among the leaders of popular opinion, took the same part. The unfortunate attempt in Wales was the ultimate result. On its failure, a considerable portion betook themselves to more moderate counsels, and in fact joined the middle classes in their plan for cutting off the enemy from plunder and prevent. Another portion held out in their terror of the consequences of allowing an increase of food; and a new invention, under the title of the "rights of labour," was brought forward for their especial use. And a large intermediate portion, admitted their consciousness of the mischief of the restrictions upon trade, but held out in opposition to the removal of these or any other abuses, upon the speculation of thereby forcing the middle classes, the Slavery Abolitionists, and any other description of reformers, to join for making the Charter into law.

The soundness of this policy is at present the question at issue. The objections to it are, that it confirms and excuses all the prejudices of the other classes, thereby diminishing the probability of its own success; and that it is on the face of things a dangerous risk, for a weaker body to say it will resist all amendment of abuses, till the stronger bodies consent to join it. The argument often advanced, that carrying the Charter would carry everything else, and therefore attempting anything else is treachery or folly,—is as infirm as the same reasoning would be, if applied to the propriety of attacking a fortress by the citadel and no where else. It is precisely because it would carry everything else, that all practicable opposition will be concentrated to prevent it. It is as if the negroes had begun with saying, "Massa, make *we* Governor."

Another weakness in the plan, lies in the probability that in spite of resistance from what may be called the "Chartists pure," abuses will be removed; and then any claim for assistance to their own objects will have been needlessly diminished. Men in general will not starve when they can help it, merely for the sake of assisting the Chartists to their particular wishes. The portions of the middle classes which will be terrified into co-operation for the Charter against their inclinations, will never be equal to the portions which

will draw off through alarm and dislike of the proceedings taken under its name. And as the middle classes, whether we like it or not, are the actual depositaries of political power, this is fatal to ultimate success. There is no use in quarrelling with the conditions of the game, and saying how we could beat if the terms were otherwise. And all this time an active portion of the Chartists apply themselves to exciting the terrors of the middle classes, always cautious and given to alarm, by the most fervid representations of what the numerous classes will do when they get the power. The tendency of all this is clear. The belief of the Ultra-Chartists that they can hinder the other classes from removing their abuses, will be found an empty boast. Abuses will be removed without them; and then they will find themselves without political power, which was their original complaint, and dependent on the charity of the other classes for such aid as they may get to their peculiar views, instead of being, as they might, a component part of a victorious alliance.

These are the sentiments of one, who would help the Charter if he could, and is only sorry to see the means of doing it thrown away.

London, 31 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Dundee Chronicle.

No. VI.

Suspicious Thankfulness of the Clergy for an Abundant Harvest.—The "Family Principle."

Sir,—I observe the clergy in your part of the country, are inviting men to be thankful for an abundant harvest. This is very disinterested in them, so far as it encourages the public in being thankful for what it is curiously contrived shall diminish the incomes of your church; and of course they will be all found among the Corn Law repealers next.

But if an abundant harvest is really a thing to thank God for, why should not the clergy equally thank God for a fair wind that brought in foreign corn; and why, above all things, should they contrive to fix their own incomes, or wink at its being contrived by other people, in a way that shall make their thankfulness always suspected, like Balaam's blessing, of being preceded by an inward leaning towards something directly contrary?

There is no use in disguising the truth, even for amusement. The clergy have an inward notion that they are to gain in the end by hanging their incomes upon the price of corn; and the landlords have a strong opinion of their interest in encouraging any clerical mistake upon that subject. It becomes useful therefore to inquire how far the clergy have any final and substantial interest in the matter.

And here needs be no attempt to conceal, that the clergyman whose income is to be measured by the market price of a certain number of quarters of corn or other agricultural produce, has a *primâ facie* interest in the market price being high. What is in fact delivered to him, is the possession of so many quarters of corn; out of which he may be considered as eating what he wants for himself, and selling the rest. On what he eats, therefore, the high price does no more than make him compensation, or put him on a level with what would have been his condition if corn had been cheaper. But on all which he does not eat,—and no man can eat all,—he gains; by the token that he has received a commodity whose exchangeable value is increased. It is no answer to say, that when the price of corn rises, the price of everything rises, and *therefore* the clergyman is no more than compensated for the difference. As often happens in disputes of this kind, the fact stated is true, but the "*therefore*" not. It may be true that when corn rises everything rises; but it is not true that everything rises *so much as to make the price of a given quantity of corn purchase no more of things in general than before.* On the contrary when corn rises either through scarcity or an increased number of mouths, the thing meant is, that corn exchanges for a greater quantity of things in general than it did before. And contrarywise when the price of corn falls, there would be no use in telling the clergyman it was balanced to him by his getting corn cheaper for his own consumption; for this would be true only of the portion of his income he expends on corn.

It may seem therefore to be an adventurous project, to attempt to tell the clergy that after all, their class has no real interest in the restrictions upon food. And yet the wisdom of Providence, which is greater than the wisdom of the church, may have so appointed it, if they could only find it out.

Your clergy have families. They of all men are the most given to surround themselves with creature comforts of that nature. It is through these, then, that they are reached. Of what use is it to a clergyman that he sees his income raised in the proportion of £.120 to £.100, if at the same

time there is brought on a state of things which leaves him all his children to keep? Of the energetic Scotsmen who make their way in the world (and no men upon earth have such a reputation for it), a very large portion would be found to be the sons of the clergy. But if all at home are shut up on a limited quantity of food, it seems clear that as far as home employment is concerned, they must meet their share in the impossibility there is for honest men to live by toil. All cannot get writerships and so live upon the fat of India. That some shall have them, will be very likely to be held out in temptation, to keep the whole in order. But it does not take more than a northern intellect to see, that this is baiting with a sprat to catch a whale, and that the worthy teachers of the kirk lose vastly more than they realize.

The same reasoning will apply to the English clergy so far as their incomes are dependent on the value of the tithes of a given district; but with this further circumstance against the English, that their incomes are to be diminished not only by what might be the diminished price of corn, but by what might be the diminished quantity produced from a given district under the reduced prices. Yet on the whole there can be no reasonable doubt, that besides the exaggerated apprehensions entertained of what might be the consequences of a free trade in corn in either or both of these ways, the interest of the English clergy in what may be called the "family principle," would greatly turn the scale.

It would appear therefore that the Scottish clergy are more favourably situated than the English, for penetrating the fallacy of allowing themselves to be persuaded that they have an interest in the scarcity of food. And it would be no more than the country would receive as comporting well with the character of intelligent and disinterested teachers, if some of them would discover the desirableness of taking the popular side, in a case where their own substantial interest is really in the same direction.

London, 29 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Midland Counties Illuminator.

No. I.

POLITICAL JUSTICE.

SIR,—It gives me great pleasure to find myself invited, to contribute to the illumination of the Midland Counties contemplated in your title.

It is accurately true that POLITICAL JUSTICE is what we want, and all we want. The definition of Justice is, that it is that rule, the general maintenance of which, would effect the greatest quantity of happiness. You seem to have been most fortunate, in blazoning this principle in the fore-front of your battle. For what are all commotions, outbreaks, jealousies, ridings-down by Horse Guards or shootings-down by infantry, but declarations that men have not been able to find out or to secure the execution of POLITICAL JUSTICE?

And, as in the establishment of legal justice there is a universal interest, so there is in the establishment of political. The parties who struggle against legal justice, always buy their advantages in the end at a hard market; and the same with political. A revolution is the ordinary ending of the obstinate refusal; and the reform of abuses, the way that lets off the explosive matter quietly.

That your plan has originated with, and will be conducted by, the Industrious Classes, is an indication that it proceeds from the quarter where there is most reason to complain of a denial of justice. *Magna Charta* uttered its celebrated "*nulli negabimus*," &c.—"we will deny to none justice and right;" but alas! it was in spirit, and as was curiously contrived in letter too, confined to the armed barons and their followers, who made the only specimens of the *liber homo* or free man, which in those days were acknowledged.

Vice and ignorance, which you protest against, keep one class down as well as another. And in the struggle of classes, those who get quickest rid of them, will find themselves at the top of the contest.

Public and private virtue, which you commend, consist in doing in public and in private what is for the general happiness. The art of the adversary lies in representing that they are something else. And the end of publications like yours, is to sift the true virtue from the false.

Your lofty declaration that "insecurity to person or

property can only proceed from the grossest ignorance or the most cruel oppression," is a beacon to all classes, in the light of which mankind is in the way of advancing to some grand conclusions.

On the dangers which surround even Liberty obtained by force, your opinions are in accordance with those of the best and ablest men who have adorned the later periods of the world. The true theory appears to be, that resistance to physical violence let loose upon us against existing forms of law, is always meritorious. Such were the resistances of the French in the Three Days, and of the Canadians. But recourse to arms to carry an increase of popular privileges, has, as you intimate, been often finally unsuccessful, and is perhaps only justifiable in the case of an oppression extreme, intolerable, and which may be considered as hopeless and immoveable by any other remedy.

In supporting the leading points of the declaration known by the title of the Charter, you will advance the soundest and clearest exposition which has perhaps yet appeared, of the essentials to the existence of rational freedom, and consequently of permanent internal quiet, in nations which have made progress in civilization and the distribution of knowledge. As such, it will always afford a measure, both of our progress, and of our actual condition.

As the means to this object, nothing can be so directly useful, as spreading the acquaintance with good deeds and wise thoughts, which have received the stamp of experience and time. And it will be for you to prove, that the current of events and knowledge has not been in favour of our adversaries, as they are ever ready to assume.

A Prospectus more promising has not for a long time seen the light. May the success be equal!

London, 31 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leeds Times.

No. XLI.

MR. O'CONNELL'S LETTER OF 12 DEC. 1840 TO LEEDS TIMES.

SIR,—The characteristic letter of Mr. O'Connell of the 12th of December to your Journal, which appears in your paper of the 26th, contains matter which involves the ne-

cessity of a reply. But I can easily understand, that inconveniences might arise from your journal being made the vehicle at the present conjuncture. It will therefore effect the object as well, if the answer is sent to such journals as may copy the communication from Darrynane; some of which will in all likelihood give currency to the reply*.

The only point which I will urge on the present opportunity, has reference to the other letter of the Irish leader in the same number of your journal, and to his previous letter of 16 November in your paper of 28 November. The infirmity of his defence of the advice to form a Convention. is that *he never told us of the dangers.* He put us on a course, in which if there really was a way out at all, the chances of hitting it were as nothing. The bridge of the Mohammedans, with an edge like a razor, is only a type of it. In his letter from Dublin of 22 December, we are assured there would be no danger if the delegates had all been elected by public meetings or primary assemblages met *pro hac vice.* But in the letter of 16 November there was nothing about *pro hac vice*, or public meetings either. The Reformers "in each locality in England were to elect delegates," and in number "proportioned to the body of Reformers in that district;" which no man alive would have construed into something to be done by a public meeting, but by the Reformers by themselves in such societies or meetings of their own as might already be in use. Mr. O'Connell was to "get himself elected by the Irish resident at Liverpool, Manchester, or any other of the great towns." Were the Irish to be a public meeting, or a public meeting the Irish?

This is the point at issue; and not whether it was possible to walk through the hot plough-shares or not. And truly a fiery trial it was to be. If of the hundred meetings to chuse delegates, none ever met a second time, or had a committee that ever did anything besides, or anything which in the eyes of an Attorney-General and a Whig-Conservative or Tory-Conservative judge and jury could relieve it from the imputation of being *pro hac vice* only, then there is a theory that the delegates might escape. And if after their assembly they never communicated through any committee or missionary, with anybody or anything that was not in the eyes of the critics aforesaid a public meeting, they might escape

* See Letter to Editor of Statesman, 7 Jan. 1841, in Vol. VI. p. 22.

being declared a seditious meeting *de novo*, a fresh fountain of iniquity independent of the vices of origin. So that a double set of plough-shares was to be laid, and we were to take our chance of steering through all. The Irish leader would plainly have let us go on if we would.

London, 30 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Leicestershire Mercury.

No. X.

Case between an English and German Manufacturer.—Dr. and Cr. Account between Leicester and Germany.

Sir,—As it is impossible to treat fully on the spot all questions which may arise at the end of an extended lecture, it will probably be disagreeable to nobody, to see some of those which appear in your last week's report of the Lecture on the Corn Laws, treated a little more at large.

The first I note, is the question whether if our manufacturers were enabled by the removal of the Corn Laws to compete with the Germans in for instance the American market, the power of so competing could come from any where but the reduction of the wages of the operatives.

Without stopping to ask why the masters, if they are to gain their end by reducing wages *after* the removal of the Corn Laws, cannot do it by reducing them *now*,—the case seems capable of being stated in something like a debtor and creditor account. And if any of your Leicester traders or their clerks would do me the favour to look over the items in what follows, and correct them in point of proportion to one another if they want it, the statement might receive additional clearness in the eyes of commercial men.

Put the supposition then, that the substantial wages and mode of living of the operative are exactly the same at Leicester and in Germany, and that the powers of machinery, capital, and obtaining the raw material, are so exactly equal on both sides, that the cost of making a bale of goods of the kind you deal in, is the same at Leicester and in Germany, with the single exception of the difference in the price of the workmen's food; and let Leicester and Germany rival each other in trading with America, and let the cotton which shall be supposed the article in which the returns from America can best be vested, sell for exactly the same price per pound in Leicester and in

Germany, according to the most accurate rate of exchange in existence. But let the operation of the single exception be, that in England the price of corn is by virtue of the Corn Laws double the price it is in Germany; in consequence of which the peck of corn which makes part of the wages of the operative per day or any other given time, costs twice as much in England.

Imagine then that the German is driving barely a comfortable trade with America, making both ends meet to keep himself and operatives; and see what becomes of you at Leicester.

The account will stand as follows; in which four dollars are taken to be equal to one pound sterling.

GERMAN BALE.

Dr.	*dol.*
To cost of raw material and machinery	40
To wages of operatives, exclusive of a peck of corn per day to each.	40
To corn at a peck per day to each operative.	20
To Profits	10
	110
Cr.	
By Cotton received and sold.	110
Balance	*nil*

LEICESTER BALE.

Dr.	£.	*s.*
To cost of raw material and machinery	10	0
To wages of operatives, exclusive of a peck of corn per day to each..	10	0
To corn at a peck per day to each operative	10	0
To Profits	2	10
	32	10
Cr.		
By Cotton received and sold	27	10
Balance, *Dr.*	5	0

Is there a man in Leicester who does not see, that if the German is making both ends meet, the Leicester trader or his operatives must be out of pocket by exactly the difference in the price of corn?

Or to put it in another point of view, the landlords have raised the price of corn by exclusion, with the express purpose that a peck of their corn shall exchange for twice the quantity of everything else it would have done. Two pounds of cotton therefore instead of one, must be ticked off as what is to go for the price of the operatives' corn. The Leicester trader consequently must sell his goods in America for more cotton, or which is the same thing for more American money, than the German, to stand on the same footing when he gets the cotton home. The German therefore will drive him out of the market, by exactly the amount of those additional pounds of cotton.

The master of course will do what he can to save himself, by screwing the difference out of the operatives in their quantity of corn, or which comes to the same thing, in their wages. But this the operatives do not object to; because it is under the Corn Laws. What they object to, is having the Corn Laws removed; because they know by experience, that a master gives better wages when there is nothing but screwing down his workmen between himself and bankruptcy.

If the German operatives can "live on coarser food," then the certainty is only the greater that the Leicester trader must be undersold, and if a screw can do it, his operatives be reduced to the like pleasant change of diet. And if the Leicester concern has advantages for making cheaper in point of machinery and capital, and still is undersold, it is only a further proof how no natural or acquired advantages can stand against an artificial price of food. I use the word "concern," for the express purpose of endeavouring to impress the way in which both master and men are involved in one common interest.

The last news at Nottingham is, that German goods of the same quality are offered in America fifty per cent under the price of Nottingham ones; by which I understand two-thirds. Which seems to agree well enough with the fact, that the portion of corn finally given to the operative, costs twice as much here as in Germany.

For fear of being tedious, the other questions shall be taken up on future opportunity.

London, 30 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Manchester Advertiser.

No. XIII.

Why a Baker does not eat up his own Bread.—Why Wages are small.

Sir,—In your last paper I observe you say, that trade is "the very life of the country." Now this is precisely the point at issue. Our adversaries say trade is the very death of the country, or would be if allowed to take its course.

Even some of our Chartist friends appear to have extraordinary notions on this subject. They are partly smitten with the Irish fallacy, that Irishmen ought to eat up all their

own butter themselves. By the same rule, Cheshiremen should eat all their own cheese, Manchester men wear all their own waistcoat-pieces, and for what I can see to the contrary, you, Sir, be the reader of all your own newspapers.

It will perhaps forcibly occur to you upon this last suggestion, that the use and meaning of commerce (*com* and *merces*) is for two people to make an exchange, in consequence of which each shall obtain something he likes better than what he had before. For example, I mortally hate cheese; some people, it is understood, equally hate celery. Now if I having cheese, and another celery, have the genius to exchange, I surmise we each of us improve our suppers, in spite of all that could be done to persuade us that whatever either gains the other must lose. And the same where the advantages should be measured in money. As much cloth as can be had in Manchester for 20*s*. shall be shipped to Bordeaux (if laws will let it), and as much claret as can be had in Bordeaux for the same or equivalent money (say 24 francs) shall be shipped for Manchester; and when they arrive at their destinations, both shall sell for what will pay freight and profits, as for instance the cloth for 30 francs at Bordeaux, and the claret for 25*s*. at Manchester. In this case the source of the gain is as clear as in the other. The user has got the celery which he wanted, instead of the cheese which he did not.

If every man did all his trade himself, and no man worked for another for pay, there would be no difficulty in the discovery, that the use of foreign trade was to exchange what he did not want, or wanted less, for what he wanted more. It would be useless to tell a baker, he was poor because he did not eat up his bread. The Corn-Law-pinched child that stands at the corner of a street with three penny-worth of gingerbread upon a stall when the police will let it, does not eat it up; because it knows that if it can sell it, it will obtain what will do it more good than the gingerbread. There might by possibility come a time, when hunger should reduce it to save its life by eating up the precious store; but this would be only an act of desperation, involving the throwing away of its chance of future living,—an act much resembling what would result from following the counsels of those who say, there should be no foreign trade till all are satisfied at home.

The difficulty, as intimated, arises from the circumstance of there being men that work for pay. But if the child that sells gingerbread worked for pay, what more of sense would there be in its asking to eat up the store? It must know, if

it knows anything, that its pay must come out of the gingerbread being sold;—that if it is not sold, there can be no pay;—and that to eat it up once, would only be the sure way to have no pay to eat again. The mistake lies in confounding what might be got once in a way, with what could be got permanently;—what might be got by rushing in upon the peaceful agreements between man and man, with what would be the enduring consequences.

If somebody urges that the peaceful agreements between man and man are very hard for one side, and ought to be altered, let us ask at once why it is that an ordinary workman does not demand and obtain the portion out of the proceeds which now falls to a foreman, the foreman the share of a junior partner, and so on. It is simply because if by the wand of a fairy or other means such a state of things could be reduced to act, the disproportion of the mouths to the permitted food would set men upon under-bidding one another as fast as they were able, till in a space of time shorter than can well be assigned, things were brought back to the present state. The only curable thing, is the *present state*. The only effectual way to look for remedy, is to ask why present wages are so small, and why men consent to take them. They take them, no doubt, because they cannot help it, or because they must take or starve. But why must they take or starve? Truly, because there is so little to be shared. In that celebrated consequence of Whig manœuvres in the East, the Turkish frigate where the captain sold water to the 1400 prisoners on board, and 400 died on the passage,—the reason of the smallness of the snares, was simply the smallness of what there was to share. Imagine all these unfortunate men set to work for one another, or for those who from some source or other had the means of purchase at command,—and fancy how many drops would be the day's wages of an artisan, and how many hours a-day he might work before he could cool his parched tongue. And there seems no more mystery in why wages should be low when they are to divide a small quantity of food, than of drink. Could the unfortunate population of the frigate have got leave to touch at foreign ports where water was cheap, their suffering would have sunk at once; and the same in the case of corn. But this would have blown up the scheme of the lords and masters that were over them; and therefore there is no wonder it was not done.

The strength of the oppressors of industry at the present hour, lies in the tendency of men to look for what the Spanish

proverb calls "better bread than is made of wheat." They are gazing after some great change they expect from the heavens, and all the time the little earthly pickpockets are ridding them of their substance. To have good trade where it can be got, and with it good wages and good profits, is really all there is in trade, and ever will be. Unhappily this is the Jordan, which men cannot wash in and be clean. If somebody would come out and call upon his gods, they would follow him; and so bent are they on following somebody, that they will follow the landlords when they tell them to refuse the trade which would pay abroad, and take the trade of the landlords which will *not* pay at home.

London, 31 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Nottingham Review.

No. XI.

WHAT IS "SURPLUS PRODUCE"?—WHY IRISHMEN DO NOT EAT UP THEIR OWN BUTTER.

SIR,—Believing that you have good judges among your readers, I will proceed to canvass before them an opinion, which is not confined to the operative classes, but encouraged by individuals of great eminence and power in the political world.

And this opinion, as it is expressed in a journal before me, is that foreign trade cannot be beneficial to the community, unless it is carried on with our surplus produce; and that there cannot be a surplus produce till after all our own people are adequately supplied.

Now in this there may be a portion that is right and a portion that is wrong; and the best way to determine what is one or the other, will be to try to state the realities of the case.

Every man who makes and sells his own goods, knows that foreign trade is beneficial to him, when he can exchange his goods abroad for something that is of more advantage to him than the goods. In one sense, therefore, it may be possible to call these goods surplus. And when the work is carried on by the intervention of workmen whom he pays, the goods being exchanged abroad for something that is worth more at home than themselves, is what will give profits to the master or employer, and wages to the operatives or em-

ployed. The circumstance of being able to do this, therefore, and not of everybody at home having previously had as much of the goods as he could find in his heart to wish, is the criterion of what makes foreign trade advantageous or the contrary. People may be badly off after all; but they will be better off with the foreign exchanges than without.

To take an example, how would it answer for a baker or his journeymen, to declare they would let no bread go out of their shop, till they had taken all they could desire for themselves and families? And put the case, which is a likely one enough, that times have been hard with them, and the master has been pinching himself and family of needful food in the struggle to carry on his trade, and the journeymen have been at rack wages as is the natural consequence, and living upon a little bread for the simple reason that their wages would not afford a great deal.

What would be the result then of endeavouring to mend their position, by eating up the bread themselves? Clearly nothing but putting an end to their means of living altogether. If they lived badly by their trade before, they would only have a short life and a merry one by determining to eat up all at once. And what would be ruin if demanded from a master only just able to carry on his trade, would if demanded from a rich one, be only asking him to stop his trade and keep himself and workmen out of his past accumulations; in short another form of those invitations to holders of property to surrender it for the use of others, which holders of property never consent to while they can resist.

The invitation to the bakers to eat up their own bread, has been copied on a large scale in the recommendation to the Irish to eat up their own butter and pork. But this has been so well replied to by a public journal, that it is impossible to do better than to quote it.

'We maintain that it would be just as rational to tell the linen manufacturers of Ulster, that they ought to wear all their own shirts, as to say to the farmers of Munster and Leinster—you ought to eat all your own pork and wheat. Wine is a produce of the soil, as much as butter or corn. Shall we, therefore, inform the people of Champagne and Burgundy that they are the proper consumers of their own vintages? What would the inhabitants of the claret districts think of the politician who should address them in the following close parody on a sentence of Mr. O'Connell's speech above-quoted?—"It is no indication of the prosperity of the country to see the Lafitte, the Chateaux-Margaux, the St. Julien, and your other wines sent away before the people's eyes, whilst the half of them are drinking *vin ordinaire*, or water."'—*Morning Chronicle*, 31 Oct. 1840.

All plans for remedying the condition of the masses by dividing among them the claret or the pork, would if seriously carried out, amount to neither more nor less than a forcible division of present property; a process to which there are many objections, but which is nevertheless exceedingly likely to be reduced at all events into attempt, unless it should please Heaven in some shape or other to give the direction of nations into the hands of physicians able to let off the mischief by tapping the public misery at some effectual point. It signifies little whether the patient calls out for the operation; if he should be demanding to jump overboard like the seaman in a calenture, there is only the more occasion for the wise physician who can stick the lancet into the right vein, and produce a great calm. The public misery, brought on by a House of Commons who have sworn to an interest in the cause, is at the bottom of the delirium. Quacks are trying war, upon the St. John Long principle of counter-irritation. When they have had their fill,—for there is nobody to stop them,—somebody may think of trying the effect of liberating industry and legitimatizing commerce.

London, 30 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editors of the Sheffield Iris.

No. XII.

BROTHER JONATHAN AND THE BREAD TAX.—CLAPTRAP OF BEING "DRESSED IN DOMESTIC MANUFACTURES."

SIRS,—Brother Jonathan, as you record, emits a sarcastic opinion upon the "Bread Tax," in the form of an inquiry what may be the precise worth of a constitution, under which "30,000 fat red-nosed landlords can raise the price of penny rolls to fourpence, and send into an untimely grave multitudes of their fellow creatures."

He is right; it is a just subject of inquiry; and the desirableness of it is increased by the men being fat, and their noses red. As fat men, they are less likely to have any commiseration for the lean; and the redness of their noses implies a turn to joviality, which creates a danger that to hardheartedness they will add insult, and mock us in their cups. For instance, red-nosed men would be very likely to indulge themselves with the toast of "The land we live in, and let those who don't like it, leave it." The true meaning and explanation of which, is to be found in that portion of the

fable-book which relates how a hedge-hog quartered himself upon a rabbit's nest, and gave similar counsel to those who expressed an ignorant impatience of the consequences.

But has not our brother Jonathan got a nuisance of like kind at home; and while we willingly accept of his assistance to put the red noses out of countenance here, will he not accept of ours to demonstrate the sister foolishness he nurses up? One half America shuts out the other from British manufactures, in order that it may buy dearer and worse from the framers of the restriction. And because England at the same time shuts out American corn, the two facts are supposed in some way to make a reason for each other. By British and American algebra, the two losses make, if not a gain, a nullity. And so the world goes on; the knaves and simpletons on both sides of the Atlantic, getting the upper hand of the better men.

It would be a very useful thing for our manufacturers here, to study the American folly, as I dare say the American corn-growers meditate on ours, and try to familiarize themselves with all the unreasonableness of the proceeding. And this for the direct purpose of application to the counter case of the landlords here. For what may be missed in one instance, will possibly be perceived in the other.

To the landowners also, a dose of like consideration might be exceedingly salutary. What a work would be wrought upon their minds, if it were possible to persuade them for half an hour, that they were to have no advantage by English machinery and manufacturing skill, but were to be forced to send their custom somewhere else, for this especial reason, that the things were to be worse and dearer!

Would it be practicable to get up something like a joint agency, here and in America, for trying to truck one nation's foolery against the other's? It is to be feared, not; and the reason why, because the fools are "ridiculous strong" on both sides. We have on each side the notion, that the "rights of labour" are, to have the least that can be; and till our active citizens can find out the mistake, it is to be feared the evil must lie over.

The American further intimates, that England is apt to bully, about "every man's doing his duty." Let every man on the American side of the water do his, and we will not be found backward here, in proportion to our means and opportunities. Let him recollect, that here we have *a Court*, which, cherishes the claptrap of being "dressed in domestic manufactures;" as if it would not do quite as well, to cherish the

Sheffield man who would make the wares with which the goods could be better bought abroad.

London, 26 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the Suffolk Chronicle.

No. XII.

MODERATE DESIRES OF THE OPPONENTS OF THE CORN LAWS.—RURAL INNOCENCE.

SIR,—I am astonished that your correspondent "A FARMER" should consider me as one it is impossible to satisfy. It would be the most practicable thing in the world to satisfy me; as will some day probably be established by the thing's being reduced to practice. I should be perfectly satisfied with a reduction of the duties on foreign corn, by a shilling a-year on each step of the scale, followed by the imposition of a shilling a-year on each step of a similar scale of bounties on foreign corn, till they should reach the present amount of duties, and then to be continued for twenty years and no more, with liberty to redeem by a Compensation-Tax, of equal value in perpetuity, on rent. On which last point, as a further proof of my readiness to be contented, I should certainly be for offering liberal terms, for the reason that a bounty on imported corn would during its existence be continuing to a certain extent the same kind of restrictions on the industry of the country as before; which the tax on rent would not. I should therefore be truly glad to see the twenty years' bounty on imported corn, adopted in practice as the measure of the compensation to be received in another way more advantageous for the country and the same thing to the payers, rather than preserved in its actual form. Surely nobody was ever more easy to be satisfied.

Your correspondent's argument which follows next, it may be feared will break down under the fact, that agriculturists only pay taxes in common with others. It has been avowed over and over, that if they can prove they have any taxes which are not in common with other men, or not balanced by some equivalent taxes which fall on others, there is every readiness to hear and amend. But there is no use in a farmer's describing himself as burdened with peculiar taxes, because he is taxed for "bar iron" for his cart, while another man keeps no cart, but is taxed for his wheelbarrows.

Put the case now, which has often been put before,-of an island of fifty acres where all the inhabitants should pay heavy taxes for common purposes. Whereupon stand up the owners of the soil and say, "Because we pay taxes, and you the owners of the manufacturing powers pay too, therefore we have a right to confine you to the produce of our acres, and your manufacturing powers shall be of no use to you except so far as the produce of our fifty acres may be divided among you as the reward." Why may not the manufacturers as well stand up and say, "Because we are taxed and you too, we see in that a right to prohibit the working of your acres, for the purpose of increasing the quantity of corn which must be bought with our manufactures elsewhere"?

It would be very natural in such an island, that the owners of the fifty acres should feel a great dread of "overlapping their agricultural basis," with a "jealousy of mushroom elevations," and a horror of "excrescent populations." Tyre, Carthage, and the Hanseatic towns of Germany, they would also be very likely to appeal to; forgetting that all that is proved of those places is that they were made the abodes of much wealth, power, and happiness, instead of being *no places at all*;—no great basis, one might imagine, for an argument to stand on.

The "Paisley" argument seems to be, that Paisley being a manufacturing town where the population are caged by the Corn Laws for the sake of giving more to landlords for their corn, many things are done at Paisley which nobody ever heard of among the agricultural population. Of course, there was never any lack of "temperance, prudence, and economy," among those pastoral and happy races. But the Paisley people will be very likely to say, that all whereby they fell short of that rural innocence, might be fairly attributed to their being crowded together to work against a given quantity of food. There may be no doubt that the happy rustics may be better situated for being taught to honour the squire and "pray for the members for the county;" and so far as good results from it, they are bound to be incessant in their thankfulness. But it is hardly fair to twit the Paisley people, with the necessary consequences of the very legislation they complain of.

May I end with a hope, that we shall soon have the gratification of knowing the results of putting Paisley in the position, which would be the consequence of acceding to my very moderate expectations expressed at the beginning.

London, 31 *Dec.* 1840.

To the Editor of the True Scotsman.

No. XI.

CHINESE LAW, "BUT WITHOUT TORTURE."—ESTABLISHMENT OF TORTURE AT HOME.

SIR,—I observe in the London papers, that in some of the occurrences connected with the piratical expedition of ministers to China, a parade is made of establishing the Chinese law in the places occupied, "but without torture."

Upon this I want to suggest the desirableness, that the next time an Act of Parliament is passed directing imprisonment for offences and particularly political ones, somebody would move the insertion of the words "but without torture," and refer to the Chinese operations for example and support.

Can any good reason be given, why in the case of occupying a portion of China, a formal exception should be made to the practice of torture, and it should be left to be practised without impediment in the case of an English Act of Parliament? For everybody knows it is practised; everybody knows it is meant to be practised; everybody knows there is a direct organization for practising it. And therefore I say it is, that somebody ought to move.

And the way in which it is practised is well known to be this. The law ordains imprisonment; which means that an individual is to be for a specified time debarred of his personal freedom and retained in confinement. But at the same time that the law specifies the time, it turns over the power of adding torture without specification. It turns it over to those who are not only not responsible, but who set the ministers of the executive government at defiance if they attempt to interfere. It places it in the hands of the very individuals, who are in the mass of cases animated with the highest degree of personal animosity against the supposed culprits. It selects the aristocracy and clergy, and gives them hold of the screw of the rack; virtually saying to them, we give you the management of the rack because you are the personal enemies of the culprits, and we know you will not fail to apply the twist.

And as well the parties to whom the power is entrusted exercise it. They may not all be of malevolent dispositions, but many are; and their education and habits encourage the growth besides. A poacher, a Chartist, and a refuser of church-rates, they consider as their natural enemies; and

they think they do God service, by personal attention that the work shall not be done slackly. In the intervals of satiety from the slaughter of game-fowl and the other amusements of higher life, they refresh themselves with an inquiry into the regularity and effectiveness of their places of torment. The ladies go to the conservatory, and the gentlemen to the county prison; to see if the flowrets bloom, and the tread-wheels move themselves aright. The little girls are set down to the piano-forte, and the little boys, if they are good, are taken with papa to see if Joseph Crabtree keeps his face steady on his bench, and Dr. Thompson's bed is properly wet. The bowing apothecary receives them at the door, and reports the degrees of the thermometer he has administered in part of punishment. There is no country in the world, where a prisoner is thus turned over for execution into the hands of his enemies. And at all times, the boast of the master-executioners is, that they are "unpaid." Did ever any man take money, for doing his will upon his foe?

Our men are dropping out of prison by degrees, and therefore these things will be heard of. The Italian prisoners of Austria published their sufferings in the Spielberg, and the history runs through Europe to the damage of absolute governments all over the earth. But it remains to be seen whether anything on the continent can match what has been done here. The public waits,—but in the meantime does not doubt of the propriety of the parliamentary insertion proposed in setting out.

It is quite true that the men who would have done this for you, have been pushed out of parliament by the exertions of the Irish-English *clique*, who sold Reform and call themselves Reformers. But they will make their appearance again, or more as good. To a certainty, we will have it moved before long in a penal statute, that the imprisonment shall be "without torture." So take it for a New Year's gift, to the friends of all who may be now upon the rack.

London, 31 *Dec.* 1840.

END OF VOL. V.

London: Printed by William Clowes and Sons, Stamford Street.

00027576

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 10 February, 2016